

**INDIA**  
4805 its  
**EPIGRAPHY,  
ANTIQUITIES,  
ARCHAEOLOGY,  
NUMISMATICS  
and  
ARCHITECTURE**

**VINCENT A. SMITH  
JAMES BURGESS  
J.F. FLEET**











# INDIA

its

## EPIGRAPHY, ANTIQUITIES ARCHAEOLOGY, NUMISMATICS AND ARCHITECTURE

VINCENT A. SMITH  
JAMES BURGESS  
J.F. FLEET

ESS ESS PUBLICATIONS  
DELHI-110052

1975



CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

FIRST PUBLISHED IN INDIA 1975

4805



Published by Sheel Sethi, for Ess Ess Publications, KD/6A, Ashok Vihar,  
Delhi-110052 and printed at Rakesh Press, New Delhi-110028.



## PREFACE

Such important branches of historical investigation as epigraphy, numismatics, archaeology, and architecture are introduced into their proper place as preliminary to the chapters based upon written records, while the available evidence from both Sanskrit and vernacular literature has likewise been included. It must, however, be admitted that this method of treating the subject possesses certain inherent disadvantages. The matter of the several chapters cannot be marked off by rigid lines. For example, inscriptions comprise those on coins, and the origin of both building and sculpture is to be sought in prehistoric times. So again when the days of history proper have been reached. Periods that may conveniently be distinguished overlap one another in fact, while Northern and Southern India can hardly be brought within the same focus. It must also be borne in mind that large portions of the early history of India are still the field of conjecture and controversy, where scholars of equal eminence hold divergent views. Consequently, there may be found in the present volume some lack of logic in arrangement, a certain amount of repetition, and possibly a few inconsistencies of statement. It has been thought better to admit such apparent defects than to attempt a strict uniformity, which would only produce results inadequate and misleading. In particular, the editor has not felt it his duty to demand that the contributors should all follow a conventional spelling of Indian names and words.

The names of the authors are appended to their several chapters, but it may be desirable to enumerate them here :-



Chapter I, 'Epigraphy,' has been written by Dr. J. F. Fleet, C.I.E., late I.C.S., and sometime Epigraphist to the Government of India ; Chapters II, III, IV and VII, 'Prehistoric Antiquities,' 'Archaeology of Historical Period,' 'Numismatics,' and 'Early History of Northern India,' by Mr. Vincent A. Smith, late I.C.S., author of *The Early History of India* ; Chapter V, 'Architecture,' by Dr. James Burgess, C.I.E., formerly Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India.

Rs. 45/-



# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I

### EPIGRAPHY

	PAGE
<i>I. Introductory note</i>	I
<i>II. The value of the inscriptions</i>	3
A. The absence of ancient historical compilations in India	5
B. Pedigrees and successions	7
C. Official records	11
D. Dynastic archives and chronicles	12
E. The Purāṇas	14
F. The Rājatarāṅgiṇī	15
G. General literature and historical romances	17
H. Introductions and colophons of literary works	19
I. The inscriptions	21
<i>III. The materials on which the inscriptions have been recorded</i>	24
A. Metals	25
1. Iron	25
2. Gold and silver	25



3. Brass . . . . .	25
4. Bronze . . . . .	26
5. Copper . . . . .	26
6. Seals of copperplate records . . . . .	29
B. Other substances than metal . . . . .	34
1. Crystal . . . . .	36
2. Clay, terra-cotta, and brick . . . . .	37
3. Earthenware . . . . .	40
4. Stone . . . . .	41
(a) Rocks . . . . .	41
(b) Columns and pillars . . . . .	42
(c) Relic-receptacles . . . . .	43
(d) External parts of <i>stūpas</i> . . . . .	45
(e) Caves . . . . .	47
(f) Images and statues . . . . .	47
(g) Moulds for making seals . . . . .	
IV. <i>The topics of the inscriptions, and the reasons for which they are historically useful</i> . . . . .	49
A. Plain statements of events . . . . .	50
B. Records due to religious motives . . . . .	52
C. Records of religious endowments . . . . .	57
D. Records of secular donations . . . . .	58
E. The essential nature of the inscriptions . . . . .	60
F. The great number of the inscriptions . . . . .	62
G. The precise dating of the inscriptions . . . . .	64
V. <i>General observations and indications of lines of future research</i> . . . . .	65
A. The inscriptions . . . . .	67
B. Tradition . . . . .	70
C. Palaeography, coins, and art . . . . .	73
D. Geography . . . . .	76
E. Other fields of work . . . . .	83
F. Concluding remarks . . . . .	85
List of abbreviations . . . . .	87

## CHAPTER II

## PREHISTORIC ANTIQUITIES

Introductory . . . . .	89
The Stone Age in India . . . . .	90
Palaeolithic implements . . . . .	90
Neolithic implements . . . . .	92
'Pygmy flints' . . . . .	92



Implement factories . . . . .	93
'Cinder-mounds' . . . . .	94
'Cup-marks' . . . . .	94
Ruddle drawings . . . . .	94
Tombs . . . . .	95
Adichanallūr . . . . .	97
Copper implements . . . . .	97
Iron . . . . .	98
Selected references . . . . .	99

## CHAPTER III

## ARCHAEOLOGY OF HISTORICAL PERIOD

Scope of the chapter . . . . .	101
Transition from prehistoric times . . . . .	101
The earliest Indian building . . . . .	102
State of civilization 450 B.C. . . . .	102
Wooden architecture . . . . .	103
Early period of Indian art, 250 B.C. to A.D. 50 . . . . .	103
Distribution of remains of early period . . . . .	104
Evolution of the <i>stūpa</i> . . . . .	104
Stone railings . . . . .	104
Hellenistic and Persian influence . . . . .	105
Bharhut . . . . .	106
Sānchī . . . . .	108
Monolithic pillars of Asoka . . . . .	109
Sculpture in the round . . . . .	109
Mathurā . . . . .	110
Jain <i>stūpas</i> . . . . .	110
Decoration of <i>stūpas</i> . . . . .	111
Sculpture in the early caves . . . . .	111
The second or Kushān period . . . . .	112
History . . . . .	112
Influence of Roman taste . . . . .	112
Two principal schools of sculpture . . . . .	113
Abundance of Gandhāra sculptures . . . . .	113
General description of Gandhāra sculptures . . . . .	114
The sculptures illustrate the Newer Buddhism . . . . .	114
Chronology of the Gandhāra school . . . . .	115
Amarāvati . . . . .	115
The Ajantā paintings . . . . .	117
Technical execution . . . . .	117
Age of the paintings . . . . .	118



CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh	PAGE
Subjects of the paintings . . . . .	118
Aesthetic merits . . . . .	119
Origin and artistic affinities of the paintings . . . . .	119
Decline of the art of sculpture . . . . .	121
Religion and sculpture . . . . .	121
Art of the Gupta period (A.D. 320-480). . . . .	122
Māmallapuram sculptures . . . . .	123
Chālukya sculpture . . . . .	123
The towers of Chitor . . . . .	123
Bhuvanesvar, Khajurāho, and Mount Abu . . . . .	124
Temples of the South . . . . .	124
Vijayanagar . . . . .	125
Hindu decoration on early Muhammadan buildings . . . . .	125
Foreign modes of decoration . . . . .	126
Mother-of-pearl inlay . . . . .	126
Geometric marble inlay . . . . .	127
<i>Pietra dura</i> . . . . .	127
Tomb of Jahāngir at Lahore . . . . .	128
Early examples of enamelled tiles . . . . .	128
The Chīnī-kā-Rauza near Agra . . . . .	128
Glass mosaics . . . . .	129
Paintings of the early Mughal period . . . . .	129
Paintings in Chinese style . . . . .	130
The so-called 'Annunciation' . . . . .	130
Akbar's patronage of painting . . . . .	130
Failure to found a national school of painting . . . . .	131
Mughal sculpture; the elephants at Delhi . . . . .	131
Bas-reliefs at Nūrmahal . . . . .	132
Pictured tiles at Lahore . . . . .	132
Rarity of specimens of minor arts . . . . .	132
Jewelled jade . . . . .	133
Rock crystal . . . . .	133
Jewellery . . . . .	133
Authorities . . . . .	133
	134

## CHAPTER IV

## NUMISMATICS

*I. The Ancient Coinage of Northern India*

Introductory . . . . .	
'Punch-marked' coins . . . . .	135
Cast coins . . . . .	135
Bactrian coins . . . . .	137
	137



	PAGE
Kushān coins . . . . .	138
Kanishka . . . . .	139
Huvishka . . . . .	140
Vāsudeva . . . . .	140
Gupta coins . . . . .	141
Satrap coins . . . . .	142
Degraded coins . . . . .	142

## II. Muhammadan and Indo-European

Muhammadan coins . . . . .	143
Ghaznī coins . . . . .	143
Ghorī coins . . . . .	144
The Slave dynasty . . . . .	144
Alā-ud-dīn . . . . .	144
Kutb-ud-dīn . . . . .	145
Tughlak coins . . . . .	145
Sūri coins . . . . .	145
Akbar's coins . . . . .	146
Jahāngīr's coins . . . . .	146
Shāh Jahān's coins . . . . .	147
Aurangzeb's coins . . . . .	147
The Company's coinage . . . . .	148
Modern Native States . . . . .	149
European coins . . . . .	149

## III. Southern India

'Punch-marked' coins of the South . . . . .	150
Gold coins of the South . . . . .	151
Principal references . . . . .	153

## CHAPTER V

### ARCHITECTURE

Early architecture—wooden . . . . .	156
Stone architecture— <i>stūpas</i> . . . . .	158
Cave-temples . . . . .	161
Gandhāra monuments . . . . .	165
Gupta architecture . . . . .	167
Kashmīr architecture . . . . .	168
Jain temples in Kanara . . . . .	170
Dravidian architecture . . . . .	170
Chālukyan architecture . . . . .	174
Indo-Aryan style of architecture . . . . .	177
Muhammadan architecture . . . . .	181
The Sharkī style . . . . .	184



	PAGE
Mālwa . . . . .	185
Bengal . . . . .	188
Gulbarga and Bidar . . . . .	193
Gujarāt . . . . .	195
Bijāpur . . . . .	196
Mughal Saracenic style . . . . .	198
Bibliography . . . . .	201



## CHAPTER I

### EPIGRAPHY

#### *I. Introductory Note*

THE subject of this contribution to the Epigraphy is the explanation of the nature and value of the epigraphic or inscriptional bases of Indian research for the pre-Musalmān period. And the topic is an important one; for, not only is India particularly rich in inscriptional remains, but also those remains are the only sure grounds of historical results in every line of research connected with its ancient past. We have, however, to exclude from our treatment of this subject one branch which has always been found more generally attractive than any of the others. The inscriptions on coins and gems, better termed, by way of avoiding confusion, 'legends' on coins and gems, are epigraphic materials. But they are a special class of such materials; and the treatment of them falls, most properly, under the subdivision of numismatology. We have to confine our attention here to those epigraphic remains which have come to be best known as 'inscriptions' by way of distinction from the numismatic materials. Nevertheless, we hope to be able to show that our topic is no dry and dull one, but is full of interest as well as importance.

The inscriptions, thus indicated as our topic, are notifications, very frequently of an official character, and generally more or less of a public nature, which recite facts, simple or complex, with or without dates, and were intended to be lasting records of the matters to which they refer. They are in almost all cases found engraved, not written. They were occasionally engraved



upon monuments in the shape of great monolithic columns ; as, for instance, in the case of some of the moral and religious edicts of Aśoka, and the panegyric on the two columns of victory at Mandasōr, in Mālwa, which recites the conquests of king Yaśōdharman. Mostly, however, they are found engraved on metal plates, on stone tablets, on rocks, on walls and pillars and other parts of caves or of temples and other buildings, on pedestals of images and statues, and on relic-caskets. But they are occasionally found painted, and in a few instances written with ink. And some are found stamped on clay and bricks.

For the purposes that we have in view, the inscriptions include, with the exception of the legends on coins and gems, everything inscriptive, written, painted, stamped or engraved, public or private, lengthy or brief, that can be turned to account in connexion with the ancient past of India, in respect of the political history, the religious development, or any other line of research. Even the mere records of pilgrims' visits are of value, in establishing the antiquity of the sacred places visited by them, and of the towns from which they came. Even descriptive labels, incised as accompaniments to statues and sculptures, are valuable, in marking the ancient times to which traditions and legends and mythological notions may be carried back. Even a name stamped on a brick has been found of use, in determining the period to which a building may be referred. And even masons' marks, in the form of alphabetical characters, have played an important part in the inquiry into the history of writing in India.

Such are the remains with which we are to deal, and of which we shall speak either as 'inscriptions,' or as 'epigraphic records,' or simply as 'records,' according to the convenience of the moment. But we are to handle them to only a certain extent.

There are technical details connected with the inscriptions into the treatment of which we cannot, for various reasons, enter here. For the palaeographic branch of Indian epigraphic research, which explains the alphabets in which the inscriptions were written, and deals with the origin and development of those alphabets, we can here only refer to Professor Bühler's *Indische Palaeographie*, published in 1896. In respect of the languages used in the inscriptions, we can only say here that they include Sanskrit, Pāli, some of the Prākṛits, the mixed dialect or dialects, and the older dialects of Kanarese, Marāṭhī, Malayālam, Tamil, and Telugu ; adding that, though in this detail some of the records offer problems which have still to be solved, they present no substantial initial difficulties to explorers



who will use, along with grammars and dictionaries, the more recently and critically edited treatments of the texts and translations. In respect of the diction, we can only observe that the inscriptions were composed sometimes entirely in prose, sometimes entirely in verse, and sometimes in prose and verse mixed. And, in respect of the eras in which so many of the inscriptions were dated, and of the methods according to which the precise dates were stated, we can only refer to certain special works and tables which will be mentioned farther on. Those are technical topics which cannot be handled here. Also, while a sufficient indication must be given of the various purposes to which the inscriptions can be applied, we shall not present here even a summary of the historical and other results obtained from them; those results form the topics of other contributions to this volume.

We have to deal here with the inscriptions from other points of view. We have to explain the nature of them. We have to illustrate the value of them, and show in a general way the ends to which they may be utilized, and establish the necessity for an exhaustive examination of them. And we have to indicate the nature of the work which still remains to be done on them, and to point out certain subsidiary lines of research which ought to be systematically followed up in connexion with them. In leading, as we hope to do, new workers into a field of exploration in which there is a vast amount of important work still to be done, especially in connexion with the more ancient periods, we have to make the way easy for them, by showing them how to avoid the mistakes of previous explorers, and how to direct their own inquiries to the greatest advantage.

## *II. The Value of the Inscriptions*

Rich as have been their bequests to us in other lines, the Hindūs have not transmitted to us any historical works which can be accepted as reliable for any early times. And it is almost entirely from a patient examination of the inscriptions, the start in which was made more than a century ago, that our knowledge of the ancient political history of India has been derived. But we are also ultimately dependent on the inscriptions in every other line of Indian research. Hardly any definite dates and identifications can be established except from them. And they regulate everything that we can learn from tradition, literature, coins, art, architecture, or any other source.



While, however, the inscriptions contain the historical and other information which we seek, they were written, engraved, and published, not with the object of presenting that information, but for other purposes which will be made apparent further on; and as a rule it is only incidentally, and as a purely secondary consideration, that they record the details which are so valuable to us. The collection of those details, therefore, is a matter that requires time and patience. The general value of the inscriptions lies mostly in the way in which they all work in, one with another. It follows that our results are, for the most part, obtained only by an examination and combination of large numbers of the epigraphic records; as, for instance, in the process which enabled Professor Kielhorn (see IA, 20. 404 ff.<sup>1</sup>) to dispel the influence of a myth, the Vikrama-legend, which had long dominated certain theories about the history of Sanskrit literature and other matters, by showing that the so-called Vikrama era, beginning in 58 B.C., was neither established by, nor designedly invented in memory of, any king Vikramāditya who actually flourished at that time<sup>2</sup>. It is not always

<sup>1</sup> For the explanation of the abbreviations used in this chapter, see the list on page 87 f. below.

<sup>2</sup> The legend belongs specially to the Jains. As regards this part of it, Professor Kielhorn has shown that the era of 58 B.C. was known in A.D. 473 and 532-33 as 'the reckoning of the Mālavas,' and in A.D. 879 as 'the Mālava time or era,' and that records of A.D. 738 and 1169 speak of it as 'the years of the Mālava lord or lords.' He has shown that the word *vikrama* is first found coupled with it in a record of A.D. 842 which speaks of 'the time called *vikrama*,' and that we hear for the first time of a prince or king named Vikrama, in connexion with the era, in a poem composed in A.D. 993, the author of which gives its date by saying that he was writing one thousand and fifty years 'after king Vikrama had ascended to the pure dwelling of the immortals.' And he has shown that the first specific mention of the era as having been established by Vikramāditya is in a record of A.D. 1198. He has pointed out that these facts 'would seem to indicate that the connexion of Vikrama with the era grew up gradually, or was an innovation which took centuries to become generally adopted.' And he has put forward the very reasonable opinion that the word *vikrama*, from which the idea of the king Vikrama or Vikramāditya was evolved, most probably came to be connected with the era by the poets, because the years of the reckoning originally began in the autumn, and the autumn was the season for commencing campaigns, and was, in short, the *vikrama-kāla* or 'war-time.'

On the general question, reference may be made to a note by the present writer, in IA, 1901. 3 f. All the results of epigraphic research emphatically endorse Professor Kielhorn's conclusions, and point, as far as we can see at present, to the period between A.D. 842 and 993 as the time during which



that a single inscription, taken by itself, will establish anything of special importance; and we must, at any rate, not make a start in epigraphy with the expectation of achieving a great discovery in the first new record that we examine. It is not every day that we are able to obtain a Rummindēr inscription (EI, 5. 4) which locates at once the birthplace of a Buddha; or a Mandasōr inscription (F.GI, 79, and see introd., 65 ff.) which settles at once the long-disputed question of the epoch of an Indian era, that of the great Gupta kings; or a Takht-i-Bahāi inscription which (see JRAS, 1905. 223 ff.; 1906. 706 ff.) furnishes corroborative evidence of a Christian tradition about an apostle and an Indian king, St. Thomas and Gondopherne<sup>1</sup>.

### A. The Absence of Ancient Historical Compilations in India

It has been said above, that the Hindūs have not bequeathed to us any historical work which can be accepted as reliable for any early times. It is, indeed, very questionable whether the ancient Hindūs ever possessed the true historical sense, in the shape of the faculty of putting together genuine history on broad and critical lines. As we shall see, they could write

the first crude rudiments of the full legend were evolved, or at least were brought into something like a substantial story.

It has further now become clear that that part of the legend which connects certain alien foes with Vikramāditya is ultimately based upon nothing but a confusion (see JRAS, 1905. 643 ff.; 1906. 161, 176) between Śaka, Śāka, as the name of a foreign people, and the epigraphic forms Śaka, Śāka, = Sakka, Śakka, Sakya, Śākya, Śākya, a 'Buddhist.' That part of it rests, not upon wars between an Indian king and foreign invaders of his country, but upon the rivalry, with varying success, during the first centuries before and after the Christian era, between the Buddhists and the Jains.

The reckoning of 58 B.C. was founded by Kanishka, in the sense that the opening years of it were the years of his reign; it was set going as an era by his successor, who, instead of breaking the reckoning, so started, by introducing another according to his own regnal years, continued it; and it was accepted and perpetuated as an era by the Mālava people, and so was transmitted to posterity by them: see JRAS, 1905. 233; 1906. 979; 1907. 169.

<sup>1</sup> In connexion with this matter it may be added that, whereas the Syriac version of the Acts of St. Thomas mentions a certain Gad as a brother of king Gūdnaphar, Gondopherne<sup>1</sup> (IA, 1904. 4), there has recently been obtained, from the territory to which the Takht-i-Bahāi inscription belongs, an intaglio (see the *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India* for 1902-3. 167) which bears the Kharōshthī legend *Gadasa*, 'of Gada (Gad).' It would be rash to jump to the conclusion that we have here a souvenir of Gad himself, brother of Gondopherne<sup>1</sup>. But we have evidence, in this new discovery, that the name Gad is at least not purely legendary.



short historical compositions, concise and to the point, but limited in extent. But no evidence of the possession by them of the faculty of dealing with history on general lines has survived to us in the shape of any genuine historical work, deliberately written by them as such, and also accurate and reliable.

The experience of the Arabian writer Albērūnī, in the eleventh century, was, that 'the Hindūs do not pay much attention to the historical order of things, they are very careless in relating the chronological succession of their kings, and when they are pressed for information and are at a loss, not knowing what to say, they invariably take to tale-telling.'<sup>1</sup> And certainly, such attempts as have been made by the Hindūs of more recent times do not display any capabilities from which we might infer that their early ancestors possessed the faculty, even if they did not exercise it.

Early in the last century, there was put together—apparently quite spontaneously, and not in consequence of any lead given by western inquiries—a Kanarese compilation entitled Rājavalikathe, or 'the story of the succession of kings,' which purports to trace the history of Jainism, especially in connexion with the province of Mysore, on the political history of which, also, it pretends to throw light, from the earliest possible times: the published extracts from this work<sup>2</sup>, however, show that it is simply an imaginative production, of the most fanciful kind, based on the wildest legends, to which no value of any sort can be attached for early historical purposes<sup>3</sup>. At apparently some earlier time, as yet not fixed, there was drawn up, in the same part of the country, a Tamil chronicle entitled Koṅgudēsarājakkal<sup>4</sup>, or 'the kings of the Koṅgu country,' which purports to give a connected historical account of Mysore from the first century A.D.: but in this case, again, the fanciful nature of the work, and its utter want of reliability for any purposes of early

<sup>1</sup> Sachau's translation of Albērūnī's India, 2. 10.

<sup>2</sup> See EC, 2, Inscriptions at Śravaṇa-Belgoḷa, introd. 3 ff., 8 ff., 25 f., 61.

<sup>3</sup> For one illustration of this, see IA, 21. 157; and regarding the apocryphal character of one of the earlier works on which it may be based, the Bhadrabāhucharita, see EI, 4. 23, note 1.

<sup>4</sup> There is an abstract of the contents of this work, by Dowson, in JRAS, 1846. 1 ff.; and a translation, by Taylor, in the Madras *Journal of Literature and Science*, 14, 1847. 1 ff. Burnell condemned the work in his *South-Indian Palaeography*, 1874. 26, note 1; 1878. 33, note 1.

Regarding the 'Chronicle of Toragal,' another document of the same class, but on a smaller scale, produced by the astrologers of Belgaum and Manōli, see IA, 30, 1901. 201, note 3.



CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh, history, are disclosed at once by the very slightest thoughtful examination in the light of present knowledge: for instance, at the outset, not only does it give, as real facts, the fictitious pedigree and history with which we are familiar from the spurious copperplate records of the Western Gaṅga series, but also (see EI, 3. 170), before the first of the fictitious Gaṅga kings, it places in the period A.D. 82 to 178, and before that time, some of the Rāshtrakūṭa kings whose dates really lay between A.D. 675 and 956. Notices of other chronicles, relating, for instance, to the Chōla, Pallava, and Pāṇḍya territories and to the Teliṅgāna country, are to be found in Professor H. H. Wilson's *Descriptive Catalogue of the Mackenzie Collection*. These have, perhaps, not yet been criticized in detail. But a perusal of the notices discloses features very similar to those of the Rājavalikathe and the Koṅgudēśa-rājakkal. And, though they may be of some use in the geographical line of inquiry, we have no prima-facie reason to expect to find in these works, also, anything of the slightest historical value for early days.

### B. Pedigrees and Successions

Yet there were once, undoubtedly, genuine materials in abundance, from which histories of the most valuable kind might have been compiled in ancient times.

In the first place, we, who have lived in India, know how, in that country, pedigrees are always forthcoming, even in the present day, to an extent that is unknown in western lands. Among families connected in any way hereditarily with the administration, even the Gaḍas or Pāṭils (the village headmen) and the Kuḷkarnīs (the accountants) can always bring forward, whenever there is any inquiry into their *watans* or rights and privileges, or any dispute among themselves, genealogical tables, unquestionably not altogether unauthentic, which exhibit the most complicated ramifications of their houses, and often go back for two or three centuries; and even the death of an ordinary cultivator usually results in the production of a similar table, though of more limited scope, in the inquiry that is held to determine his heirs. Every *maṭha* or religious college of any importance preserves the succession of its heads. And among the Jains we have the Paṭṭāvalis or successions of pontiffs, for a full and lucid notice of some of which we are indebted to Dr. Hoernle (IA, 20. 341; 21. 57)<sup>1</sup>. They purport to run

<sup>1</sup> For others, see Klatt in IA, 11. 245. 251; Peterson's *Second Report on*



back to even the death of the last Tīrthaṃkara Vardhamāna-Mahāvīra in (let us say) 527 B.C.; and, though the earlier portions of them were probably put together in their present form not before the ninth century A.D. (because they exhibit the Vikrama-legend; see page 4 above, and note 2) and with results that are capable of considerable adjustment, they are, no doubt, based upon more ancient and correct lists that were then extant.

The preservation of pedigrees and successions has evidently been a national characteristic for many centuries. And we cannot doubt that considerable attention was paid to the matter in connexion with the royal families, and that Vamśāvalis or Rājāvalis, lists of the lineal successions of kings, were compiled and kept from very early times. In fact, the matter is not one of speculation, but is capable of proof. We distinctly recognize the use of such Vamśāvalis, giving the relationships and successions of kings, but no chronological details beyond the record of the total duration of each reign, with occasionally a coronation-date recorded in an era, in the copperplate records. We trace them, for instance, in the introductory passages of the grants of the Eastern Chalukya series (see, e.g., IA, 14.55; H.SII, 1. 36; EI, 5. 131; 7. 177), which, from the period A.D. 918 to 925 onwards, name the successive kings, beginning with the founder of the line who reigned three centuries before that time, but do not put forward more than the length of the reign of each of them; and, from certain differences in the figures for some of the reigns, we recognize that there were varying recensions of those Vamśāvalis. And we trace the use of Vamśāvalis again in the similar records of the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kalinga, which, from A.D. 1058 onwards (see EI, 4. 183), give the same details about the kings of that line with effect from about A.D. 890, and one of which, issued in A.D. 1296 (JASB, 65, 1896. 229), includes a coronation-date of A.D. 1141 or 1142.

There is other proof also<sup>1</sup>. There has been brought to light from Nēpāl a long Vamśāvali (IA, 13. 411), which purports to give an unbroken list of the rulers of that country, with

*Sanskrit MSS.*, 89, 163; and Bhandarkar's *Report on Sanskrit MSS.* for 1883-84. 14, 319.

<sup>1</sup> Kalhana, writing the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* in A.D. 1148-49, mentions lists of kings of Kashmīr which had been put together by Kshēmendra and Hēlārāja (compare page 16 below). But we do not quote these as proof of our present point; because they were compilations, not original lists prepared under the dynasties to which they referred.



the lengths of their reigns and an occasional landmark in the shape of the date of an accession stated in an era, back from A.D. 1768 to even so fabulous an antiquity as six or seven centuries before the commencement of the Kali age in 3102 B.C. It contains gross mistakes in chronology : for instance, it places in 101 to 34 B.C. Amśuvarman, of the Thākuri dynasty, who, we know, was ruling in A.D. 635 and 649 or 650 (F.G.I, introd., 189); and, partly through committing one of the usual leading faults of Hindū compilations, namely, of treating contemporaneous dynasties as successive dynasties, it places about the end of the seventh century B.C. a certain Vṛishadēva, of the Sūryavaṁśi or Lichchhavi dynasty, who, we know, was a contemporary of Amśuvarman. And, as was pointed out by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajī, who brought the full Vamśāvali to notice critically, 'it possesses no value whatever as a whole,' and 'no single one of its several portions is free from the most serious errors,' and it is useless for reconstructing the earlier history of Nēpāl, even by adjustment with respect to any names and dates that are known from other sources. But, in connexion with the above-mentioned Vṛishadēva, and in spite of the error in respect of his date, it teaches one thing which is of use. From him, whom it places No. 18 in the Sūryavaṁśi dynasty, to Vasantadēva, No. 23, it gives correctly a list of six successive names, which we have verified from epigraphic records. It allots to each of these rulers, it is true, a length of reign which not only is impossible in itself, but also is disproved in one case at least by the inscriptions. But the fact remains, that the names are given correctly and in the right order. This short list was certainly not based on some ancient charter read by the original compiler of this portion of the Vamśāvali. What would have happened, if that had been the case, is suggested plainly enough by the Konnūr inscription from the Dhārwar District (EI, 6. 25), which purports to be the reproduction of a charter, dated A.D. 860, of the time of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Amōghavarsha I. Here, we have a record on stone, which says that it was embodied in that shape in accordance with a copperplate charter that was read and explained by a certain Jain teacher named Vīranandin, son of Mēghachandra. Partly from the characters of the record, and partly from the established fact that Mēghachandra died A.D. 1115, we know that this record was not put on the stone before the twelfth century A.D. We do not dispute the alleged fact that Vīranandin drafted the stone record from some ancient charter on copper. But we find either that he could not read that charter



correctly, or that he did not take the trouble to interpret it aright; for, not only has he misstated the relationships of some of the Rāshtrakūṭa kings whom the stone version does mention, and omitted others whom it ought to have included, but also—probably from a wrong interpretation of some verse which we have not as yet found in a genuine record—he has placed at the head of the Rāshtrakūṭa genealogy a purely fictitious person, whom he has called Prichchhakarāja. If the list from Vṛishadēva to Vasantadēva in the Nēpāl Vamśāvali had been put together in the same way from some ancient deed, the compiler of that part of the document would undoubtedly have committed some similar mistakes. We have no hesitation in saying that he took these six names from some genuine early Vamśāvali, accessible to him, which had survived from the time of the rulers to whom it referred; and probably the duration of the reigns was given correctly by him, and was falsified subsequently by some later compiler to suit his own scheme of the whole chronology.

The Bower Manuscript has proved to us that, under favourable conditions, a document written on even so frail a material as birch-bark can survive for fourteen centuries. This manuscript was obtained in Kashgaria, on the north of Kashmīr, through excavations at 'the foot of one of the curious old erections, of which several are to be found in the Kuchar district.' It was secured and brought to notice by Lieutenant Bower (see JASB, 59, 1890. proceedings, 221), from whom it derives its name. And Dr. Hoernle has shown (IA, 21. 37), by a comparison of its characters with those of epigraphic records, that in it we have a veritable original document, which is a relic that has come down to us from the period A.D. 400 to 450. With this instance before us, we may not unreasonably hope that an exploration of some buried city, or even of one or other of the numerous private collections of ancient manuscripts that still remain to be examined, may some day result in the discovery of some of the early and authentic Vamśāvalis.

Meanwhile, we have to be very cautious in accepting what we do obtain in this line. We have before us the example, not only of the Nēpāl Vamśāvali, but also of some Vamśāvalis from Orissa, which do not indeed pretend to quite such fabulous antiquity, but which nevertheless purport to present an unbroken list of the kings of that province back from A.D. 1871 to the commencement of the Kali age in 3102 B.C., with the length of the reign of each, and with certain specified dates as epochs.



And the results put forward by them, and by the palm-leaf archives of the temple of Jagannātha at Puri, have been supposed to give at any rate certain definite and reliable landmarks in the early history. But an examination of them and of the archives (see EI, 3. 334 ff.) has shown that, for at least the period anterior to about A.D. 1100, they are utterly fanciful and misleading, and that they were devised, chiefly from imagination, simply to magnify the antiquity and importance of the temple of Jagannātha and of all its surroundings and connexions. These local annals are not correct even in respect of so radical a point as the building of that temple. They attribute it to a king Anaṅgabhīma, whom they would place A.D. 1175 to 1202; whereas we know from the epigraphic records that it was built by a predecessor of his, Anantavarma-Chōḍagaṅga-Gaṅgēśvara, in the period A.D. 1075 to 1141 or 1142. Further, they actually divide this latter king into two persons, Chōḍagaṅga and Gaṅgēśvara, to whom they would allot the periods A.D. 1132 to 1152 and 1152 to 1166. For the period anterior to him, they do not incorporate any ancient and authentic lists of rulers, but simply bring forward, amongst a host of fabulous names, a few historic kings, some of them not even connected with Orissa at all, whose dates they grossly misplace. Thus these records, again, are absolutely worthless for any purposes of ancient history.

### C., Official Records

In the genuine early Vāṁśāvalis, materials must long have been extant, which could have been turned to most valuable account, if only for the bare outlines of political history. But there were plainly more ample materials than these. Of course, the elaborate routine of modern times had not been devised. Still, with the great advance towards civilization which the Hindūs had made even in the fourth century B.C., and with the careful and detailed system of administration which is disclosed by the inscriptional remains, there must have been, from early times, a fairly extensive system of official records. In any such state of advancement there are certain precautions and arrangements, indicated by common sense, which would inevitably be adopted. Copies of important orders issued must be kept on record in the issuing office, as a reminder to make sure that instructions given are duly and fully carried out; and orders received must be filed in the receiving office, to be produced in justification of any particular measures taken in giving effect to them. The specific terms of treaties and alliances must be reduced to writing; and copies must be kept



for reference by each of the contracting parties. Diaries of some kind must be kept by local governors, from which to prepare from time to time the periodical reports on their administration. A record must be kept, on both sides, of tribute paid by the great feudatory nobles and received by the paramount sovereign. And, even under a system of farming the revenues, accounts of some kind must be framed, of the proceeds of provincial customs and taxes and of village revenues, and of the expenditure incurred on the collection of them.

Notes of all such matters must have been preserved in some form or another, in all the various offices. But it is probable that they were kept in the shape of general day-books, something like the Diaries of the Pēshwās of the eighteenth century<sup>1</sup>, dealing with all matters mixed, rather than according to any system of separate ledgers and files for each branch of business. Except on the hypothesis of such a system of day-books, it is difficult to account for the manner in which, for instance, the date of a record of A.D. 1008 at Tanjore (H.SII, 3. 14) cites the 124th and 143rd days of the twenty-fourth year of the Chōla king Rājarāja I, and the date of a record of A.D. 1113 at Tiruvārūr in the Tanjore district (EI, 4. 73) cites the 340th day of the fifth year of the reign of his descendant Vikrama-Chōladēva; for such details to be cited conveniently there must have been available some such books, in which the days were entered and numbered, and the events of them were posted up, as they ran<sup>2</sup>.

#### D. Dynastic Archives and Chronicles

In such day-books and other records, valuable items of historical information would abound. The compilation, however, of any general history from them would, no doubt, be

<sup>1</sup> For an indication of the nature of these Diaries, reference may be made to the extracts relating to political matters from the Rōjniśī or Journal of the Mahārāja Śāhu of Sātārā from A.D. 1713-14 to 1734-35, published at Poona in or about 1900. Some of the Pēshwās' Diaries themselves have, it is believed, been published since then.

<sup>2</sup> A rather curious instance of citing the days is furnished by the Tiruppūvanam grant of the Pāṇḍya king Jaṭāvarma-Kulaśēkhara (IA, 20. 288), which mentions the 4,360th day of his thirteenth year. We can hardly imagine that the numbering of the days had run on from the first day of the reign up to that high number. And we understand that, as suggested (loc. cit., 289), the writer took the fortieth day of the thirteenth year, and, for some reason or other, added it to  $360 \times 12 = 4,320$  as the total number of the days of the preceding twelve years.



a somewhat complicated and laborious matter. But there were, plainly, other materials of a more concise kind, that might have been used with great facility, in the shape of dynastic archives and chronicles, which, in some cases at least, survived for a considerable time after the disappearance of the dynasties to which they belonged, and from which comprehensive and very valuable accounts might easily have been put together.

It can only have been from ancient archives, of considerable fullness of detail, which had fallen into their own hands, that the Western Chālukya kings of Kalyāṇi (A.D. 973 to 1189) derived the knowledge that they possessed, and exhibited in some of their records, of the earlier Chalukya dynasty of Bādāmi (about A.D. 550 to 757)—separated from themselves by an interval of more than two centuries, during which an extraneous dynasty possessed the sovereignty—from which they claimed to be descended. This is pointedly illustrated by the mention, in the Kauthēm plates of A.D. 1009 (IA, 16. 15), of Maṅgalēśa, who was not in the direct line of descent, and therefore might easily have been lost sight of in a mere Vaṁśāvali, and by the preservation, in the same record, among certain other details for which tradition alone, or a mere list of kings, would not account, of the memory of the conquest by him of the territory of Rēvatidvīpa, and by the way in which the record seeks to obliterate his attempt to break the direct and rightful senior line of succession in favour of transmitting the crown to his own son, by representing him as simply a regent during the minority of his nephew Pulakēśin II, to whom, it says, he eventually restored the throne in pious accordance with the custom and laws of the Chalukya kings. And the Śilāhāra princes of the Southern Koṅkaṇ must have kept a careful record of their paramount sovereigns, the Rāshtrakūṭas (A.D. 754 to 973), as well as of themselves, to account for the statement about the rise of their own family under Kṛishṇa I. in the period between A.D. 878 and 912, and for the full account of the Rāshtrakūṭa genealogy, as well as of their own pedigree, that is given in the Khārē-pāṭaṇ plates of A.D. 1008 (EI, 3. 293), issued by the Śilāhāra Raṭṭarāja in the time of the Western Chālukya king Irīva-bedaṅga-Satyāśraya.

These cases indicate distinctly the compilation and survival of dynastic chronicles, which were doubtless carried on chapter by chapter after the death of each successive king or prince. And we can actually recognize the copy of a chapter, or of



the draft of the beginning of a chapter, of such a chronicle, compiled most probably from day-books or other such sources, in the Hāthigumphā cave-inscription, of 156-55 B.C. if it is really dated in the 165th year of the time of the Maurya kings (C.I.A, plate 17; Sixth Oriental Congress, 3. 135), which gives a succinct account of the career of king Khāravēla of Kaliṅga from his birth to the thirteenth year of his reign: it tells us that he spent fifteen years in princely sports; that for nine years he enjoyed power as Yuvarāja or heir-apparent and appointed successor; and that he was crowned to the succession at the end of his twenty-fourth year; and then it briefly enumerates, year by year, the principal events of his reign, and certain large items of expenditure on public works and charity, as far as the thirteenth year. In this department, again, we may hope that future explorations will result in discoveries of a particularly interesting kind.

### E. The Purāṇas

Those materials did not remain altogether unutilized. We can trace a use of at least Vamśāvalis in the historical chapters given in some of the Purāṇas, which do certainly indicate a desire on the part of the ancient Hindūs not to ignore general history altogether, and are clearly based upon ancient archives which had survived in a more or less complete shape and were somehow or other accessible to the composers of those works, or upon some prototype which had been so based.

At the same time it is not very much, in the way of reliable history, that we gather from these chapters in the Purāṇas. In the first place, some of the necessary materials were apparently not available to the authors, and some of the dynasties are omitted altogether. For instance, the Purāṇas do not include (at any rate with any clearness) any references to the line established in Northern India by Kanishka, who, in doing that, founded the so-called Vikrama era commencing in 58 B.C. (see page 4 above, and note 2), or to the line established in Western India by that king of Kāthiāwār and Ujjain, apparently of Pahlava, Parthian, extraction, who thereby founded the so-called Śaka era of A.D. 78. They mention the great dynasty of the Guptas (A.D. 320 to about 530) in merely a vague manner, without individual names, as kings reigning over Sāketa and the Magadha country and along the Ganges as far as Prayāga (Allahābād)—a description which can only apply to the actual rise of the Gupta power under Chandragupta I. (A.D. 320 to about 335). And with this statement



about the Guptas—whom (by the way) they would place more than three centuries ahead of the present day—they close their treatment of the dynasties : no later history is found in them. In the second place, the authors did not think it worth their while to give us any fixed points, in the shape of dates recorded in any of the Hindū eras, to which we might refer their statements. Thirdly, they are by no means in exact agreement with each other in respect of the details which they give regarding the lengths of individual reigns or even the duration of each dynasty. In the fourth place, even allowing for corruption by successive copyists, it seems plain that—be the cause what it may ; sometimes, perhaps, inability to decipher ancient characters—they have not always given us even the names of their kings with accuracy : compare, for instance, the Purāṇic lists of the Andhrabhṛityas with each other, and still more with such information about those kings as we have obtained from the epigraphic records. Finally, the chronological results of these chapters show that here, again, the authors committed the fault of treating contemporaneous dynasties as successive: thus (to take only a part of the whole list), from the beginning of the Mauryas to the end of the Kailakila-Yavanas the Purāṇas give us a total period of more than 2,500 years; apply this to 320 B.C. as the initial year of the first Maurya king Chandragupta (see JRAS, 1906. 984 f.), and we have the end of the Kailakila-Yavanas about A.D. 2200, some three centuries in the future from even the present time ; and we have to place after that a variety of other rulers, including the Guptas (A. D. 320 to about 530), who, the same works say, followed the Kailakila-Yavanas.

In short, in the historical chapters of the Purāṇas the treatment of their subject is sketchy and meagre, and the details are discrepant. We may utilize these chapters to a certain extent for general purposes, if we discriminate so as to place synchronously in different territories some of the dynasties which they exhibit as ruling successively over the same dominions. But we cannot apply them more precisely without appreciably more corroboration than has as yet been obtained from epigraphic and numismatic sources.

#### F. The Rājatarāṅgiṇī

The only other indication, that has survived from any antiquity, of an attempt on the part of the Hindūs to put together anything in the shape of a general history, is the Rājatarāṅgiṇī,



on the first eight cantos of which Kalhaṇa was engaged in A.D. 1148-49.

Kalhaṇa mentions certain previous writers: Suvrata, whose work (he says) was made difficult by misplaced learning; Kshēmendra, who drew up a list of kings, of which, however (he says) no part is free from mistakes; Nīlamuni, who wrote the Nīlamata-Purāṇa; Hēlārāja, who composed a list of kings in 12,000 verses; Padmamihira; and Chhavillākara. His own work, he tells us, was based on eleven collections of Rājakathās or 'stories about kings,'<sup>1</sup> and on the work of Nīlamuni. He says he sought to remove all errors by consulting charters issued by ancient kings, and laudatory inscriptions on stones, and manuscripts. And he has presented us with a detailed account of Kashmīr, including occasional items of external history, which purports to go back to 2448 B.C., and has given us the alleged exact details of the length of the reign of each successive king from 1182 B.C. onwards.

We may expect to find Kalhaṇa fairly correct for his own time, and for the preceding century or so. But an examination of the details of his work quickly exposes its imaginative character, and its unreliability for any earlier period. It places towards the close of the period 2448 to 1182 B.C. the great Maurya king Aśōka, whose real initial date, as determined by his *abhiśhēka* or anointment to the sovereignty, was 264 B.C. (see JRAS, 1906. 985 f.). It places in 704 to 634 B.C. Mihirakula, the great foreign invader of India, whose real period was closely about A.D. 530 (F.GI, introd. 11). It places about seven centuries after Mihirakula a Tōramāṇa, the original of whom can hardly be any other than Tōramāṇa the father of Mihirakula. And, though Kalhaṇa could put forward such exact details as four years, nine months, and one day for the duration of the reign of Mātrigupta (A.D. 106 to 111, as placed by him), he was obliged to allot to Raṇāditya I. a reign of three centuries (A.D. 222 to 522), simply in order to save his own chronology.

<sup>1</sup> Compare, especially as helping to illustrate how fictitious matter might come to be introduced into such stories and to be disseminated by them, the discourse about religion, and the recital of the praises of ancient and recent devotees of Śiva, in which Sōmēśvara IV. and his commander-in-chief indulged on a certain occasion (EI, 5. 258; see also *ibid.* 233, for another instance of a *dharmaprasaṅga* or talk about religion between village officials).



### G. General Literature and Historical Romances

With those exceptions, namely, the historical chapters of the Purāṇas and the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, the ancient Hindūs seem to have never made any real attempt to deal with history on general lines. They have left us to gather what we can from their ordinary literary works, into which they have occasionally introduced historical matter, but, as can clearly be seen, only as an incidental detail of quite secondary and subordinate importance.

In the body of their literature, the Hindūs do not help us much. The plots of some of the plays, the classical poems, and the collections of imaginative stories, were woven round historic names, both of persons and of places. But it is seldom, except in the geographical line, that such allusions can be put to any practical use. They help us to locate places, and to fix the limits of countries. For instance, we know, from other sources, that the ancient Tāmaliptī is the modern Tamlūk in the Midnapūr District; and thus an incidental statement of the Daśakumāracharita, that Tāmaliptī was in the Suhma country<sup>1</sup>, gives us a more precise indication than is obtainable elsewhere as to the exact part of Bengal that was known by the name of Suhma. १०, also, for another part of Bengal, the statement in the Dīgha-Nikāya, 1. 111; 2. 235, that Champā, which is known to be represented by a village which forms the western part of the town of Bhāgalpūr, was in Aṅga, gives us a similar indication as to the exact position of the Aṅga country. And they help us to establish the antiquity of places: thus, we know, from the Aihole inscription of the time of Pulakēśin II, that the celebrated poet Kālidāsa flourished before A.D. 634; and so the mention by him, in the Raghuvamśa, 8. 33, of Gōkarṇa, in the North Kanara District, carries back the existence of that place, as a famous Śaiva site, to at least the beginning of the seventh century A.D. In the historical line, however, the allusions teach us little, if anything. The works do not give dates for what is told in them: and naturally enough: the similar productions of other countries, also, do not aim at being historical records, and at including chronological details. The works in question are of use, historically, only when the

<sup>1</sup> The name is actually presented as Damalipta in the text, in the beginning of the sixth chapter, both in Wilson's edition and in Peterson's. There is, however, no question about that form being only a variant of the better known Tāmaliptī.



date of an author happens to be known, and we are enabled thereby to fix a latest possible limit for an historic name, mentioned by him, for which we have otherwise no specific date at all.

There are, indeed, a few compositions which put forward certain distinct historical pretensions, but which cannot, in truth, be taken as anything more serious than historical romances.

In Sanskrit, we have in prose the *Harshacharita* of Bāṇa, and in verse the *Vikramāṅkadēvacharita* of Bilhaṇa. The first deals with the achievements or career of the great northern king Harsha, Harshadēva, or Harshavardhana, of Thāṇēsar and Kanauj (A.D. 605-6 to about 648); and the second deals, in the same way, with an equally great southern king of later times, the Western Chālukya Vikramāditya VI, of Kalyāṇi (A.D. 1076 to 1126). Thus they both aim at being historical chronicles of those two periods. But they do not present the plain straightforward language of sober common sense. They imitate the classical poems, with all their elaboration of diction, metaphor, and imagery. They weave into their stories mythical and supernatural matter of the most fanciful kind. And they give us some charming reading in the poetical line. But they offer us not much beyond that. The historical information contained in the *Harshacharita* might be summed up very briefly. That in the *Vikramāṅkadēvacharita* is more extensive; mixed up, on the other hand, with more imaginative matter than is found in Bāṇa's work. But neither author has given us a date for anything that is mentioned by him. We do not blame them for this: the authors of the modern European historical novels rarely give dates; and, when they do, we should hardly accept their statements for quotation without verification. We only remark that no dates are given. Bāṇa, for instance, tells us that Harshavardhana was born 'in the month Jyāishṭha, on the twelfth day of the dark fortnight, when the moon was standing in the Pleiades, just after the twilight time, when the young night had begun to climb;'¹ but he has not given us any statement as to the year. And Bilhaṇa tells us that, when Vikramāditya was born, 'flowers fell from the sky, Indra's drum resounded, and the gods rejoiced in heaven' (IA, 5. 318); but he does not even name the month and day. Neither

¹ Translation by Cowell and Thomas, 109; but with a correction, in respect of the allusion to the Pleiades, from the text, Kashmir edition, 284.



author has given us even his own date. And so, if Harshavardhana and Vikramāditya were not known from more exact sources of a different kind, we should not even know to what period to refer the poets and their patrons.

In the same category we must place the Tamil historical poems, the Kaḷavaḷi, the Kalingattu-Parani, and the Vikrama-Chōlan-Uḷā, for our introduction to which we are indebted to Mr. V. Kanakasabhai Pillai (IA, 18. 259; 19. 329; 22. 141). In these, again, there is a great deal of charming reading, and much of interest, and a good deal of importance. But here, also, there are no dates, and therefore no means in the works themselves for determining the periods to which they belong.

These works, the dramas, the classical poems, the imaginative stories, and the historical romances, and so also the Buddhist writings both Sanskrit and Pāli, are invaluable for the study of manners and customs, trade and commerce, methods and routes of communication, geographical hints, and the details of domestic, social, public, and religious life. They would furnish excellent materials for articles such as those which the Rev. T. Foulkes has given us, from the Buddhist works, on the Deccan in the time of Gautama-Buddha (IA. 16. 1 ff., 49 ff.). And they supplement the epigraphic records admirably. But that is all they do. And, even in respect of results which we do obtain from such sources, we must always remember that the ancient Hindū writers were not archaeologists, and that, consequently, the results are liable to be for the times in which the writers wrote, rather than for the times to which their works refer.

## H. Introductions and Colophons of Literary Works

It is only in the introductions and colophons of their literary works, for a knowledge of which we are indebted largely to the detailed reports of Professor Peterson and of Dr. Bhandarkar on Sanskrit manuscripts, that the Hindūs have thought it worth their while to give us any dates to accompany such historical details as they put forward. Here, the dates are useful enough. But we find that the historical matter is introduced only incidentally, to magnify the importance of the authors themselves rather than of their patrons, and is not handled with any particular care and fullness. As typical illustrations, we take the following cases.

Sōmadēva tells us, in the colophon of his Yaśastilaka<sup>1</sup>, that he finished that work in the month Chaitra, the Śāka year 881

<sup>1</sup> Peterson's *Second Report*, 47.



expired, falling in A.D. 959, during the rule of a Chālukya prince who was the eldest son of Arikēsarin and was a feudatory of a king Kṛishṇarājadēva. But he does not take the trouble to tell us the name of the prince, presumably his immediate patron, or to state the family or even the parentage of the king, or to indicate the territory of either the sovereign or his vassal. In this case, as it happens, we learn more about the family of the prince from the Vikramārjunavijaya or Pampa-Bhārata of Pampa, who, writing A.D. 941-42, mentions as his patron the aforesaid Arikēsarin, and gives his pedigree for seven preceding generations, with apparently a tolerably definite hint as to the part of the country to which he belonged<sup>1</sup>. As regards the king Kṛishṇarājadēva, we knew, from the epigraphic records, the Rāshtrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa III, for whom we had dates in A.D. 940 and 956. And, there being no extraneous objections, we did not hesitate to identify Sōmadēva's Kṛishṇarājadēva with this Kṛishṇa III, and to extend the reign of the latter to A.D. 959, even before obtaining for him a later epigraphic date in A.D. 961 (see EI, 6. 180). In this way, Sōmadēva's literary reference usefully supplemented the inscriptions. But it teaches us, in itself, little enough. And, by the way, he might plainly have told us even a good deal more than he has. The preamble of the letter issued by his hero king Yaśōdhara<sup>2</sup>, particularly in its introduction of the titles 'supreme lord of the town Padmāvati-pura, lord of the mountain Kanakagiri, and owner of the Kailāsa-crest,' as well as in other details, is no mere ordinary epistle, but is an imitation of the formal preamble of a grant; from which we gather that Sōmadēva had access to official papers, and used one of the drafts kept on hand for preparing charters of grants.

Take, again, the case of Jahlaṇa. In the introduction to his Subhāshitamuktāvali, written in the period A.D. 1247 to 1260<sup>3</sup>, he states carefully the relationships in his own pedigree, but omits to state them in the case of the Dēvagiri-Yādava kings Bhīllama, Siṅghana, and Kṛishṇa, and their ancestor Mailugi, whom he mentions.

Take, finally, the case of Hēmādri. Writing in the period A.D. 1260 to 1271, in the time of the Dēvagiri-Yādava king Mahādēva, under whom, as also under his successor Rāmachandra, he held the post of Śrīkaraṇādhipa or super-

<sup>1</sup> Rice's Pampa-Bhārata, canto I, verses 15 to 41.

<sup>2</sup> Peterson's *Second Report*, 39.

<sup>3</sup> Bhandarkar's *Report* for 1887-88 to 1890-91, notices, 7.



intendent of the business connected with the drawing up of documents, he aimed, in the introduction to his *Vratākhaṇḍa*<sup>1</sup>, at giving the full pedigree, with incidental historical items, of that branch of the Yādavas from even Purāṇic times. In spite, however, of the free access that he must have had to the chronicles and official records of the family within the historical period, he has omitted, several times, to state the exact relationships of the successive members of the family; he has apparently passed over altogether one of them, Sēuṇadēva, whose existence is established by an epigraphic record; and, as tested by an inscription of A.D. 1191 at Gadag (EI, 3. 216; and see F.DKD, 516), he has suggested an altogether wrong inference regarding the parentage of Bhīllama, the first paramount king in the family, within only a century before the time at which he was writing.

### I. The Inscriptions

4805  
The dates which are given in the introductions and colophons of the literary works, in connexion with the composition of those works, may of course be accepted as reliable; and any genealogical and historical items put forward in the same places ought to be correct for a few preceding generations. But it would be a very extraordinary and imperfect history of India that we should put together from such references, and from the Purāṇas, the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, the historical romances, the general body of the literature, such Vamśāvalis as have been obtained from Orissa and Nēpāl, and the few items of alleged history that are incidentally given in the Paṭṭāvalis.

We should doubtless recognize that the successions of kings given for India itself by the Purāṇas, for Kashmīr by the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, and for Nēpāl by the Vamśāvali, should be taken as separate successions, in territories the histories of which must be treated separately. We should not know exactly what conclusion to arrive at in respect of the annals of Orissa, which is a province of India itself. But, having regard to the preposterous duration allotted to each of the reigns from 3102 to 58 B.C., we should doubtless decide that all memory of the true history of that period had been lost in Orissa, and that from the next fixed point, A.D. 78, Orissa was an independent province with a history and a line of kings of its own. We could scarcely fail to detect the occurrence, in the Purāṇas, the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, and the Nēpāl

<sup>1</sup> Bhandarkar's text in the *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, i, part 2. 268.



Vaṁśāvali, of one particular name, that of Aśōka, which ought to establish a definite synchronous point in the histories of the three countries. We should not be able to deduce the date of Aśōka from the Purāṇas. But we should find that the Rājatarāṅgiṇī would place him somewhere about 1260 B.C. We should find, indeed, that the Nēpāl Vaṁśāvali would place him, roughly, about 2600 B.C. As, however, that list does not mention him as a ruler of Nēpāl, but only as a visitor to the country, we should probably infer a mistake in that account, and prefer to select the date of 1260 B.C. And then we should set about arranging the succession of the kings of India itself, from the Purāṇas, with 1260 B.C. for the approximate date of the accession of Aśōka as our starting-point<sup>1</sup>.

We should then examine the other available sources of information. And probably we should first note, from the Jain Paṭṭāvalis, the king Vanarāja, who is said to have founded Aṇhilwād, in Gujarāt, in A.D. 746 (IA, 11. 253); and we should obtain the alleged succession at Aṇhilwād after him, with an initial date for each king, to A.D. 1304, from the Pravachana-parīkshā of Dharmasāgara<sup>2</sup>. From the literary works we should obtain a few names, with fixed dates, such as the following. Jinasēna tells us (see EI, 6. 195), in the Jain Harivaṁsa, in connexion with the date of that work, that in A.D. 783-84 there were reigning—in various directions determined with reference to a town named Vardhamānapura, which is to be identified with the modern Waḍhwān in the Jhālāvād division of Kāthiāwār—in the north, Indrāyudha; in the south, Śrīvallabha; in the east, Vatsarāja, king of Avanti (Ujjain); in the west, Varāha or Jayavarāha, in the territory of the Sauryas. And from the Channabasavapurāṇa we should have (but, in this case, falsely; because his real date was A.D. 1156 to 1167) a king Bijjala reigning at Kalyāṇi, in the Nizam's Dominions, contemporaneously with them. Guṇabhadra gives us, in recording the completion of his Uttarapurāṇa (see IA, 12. 217), a king Akālavarsha, with the date of A.D. 897. Pampa gives us (see page 20 above) a Chālukya prince Arikēśarin, with the date of A.D. 941, with his pedigree for seven generations, and with, apparently, a hint that he was ruling the territory round the modern Lakshmēshwar in the Dhārwar District. Sōmadēva gives us

<sup>1</sup> A beginning was actually made, in almost the manner suggested above, by Sir William Jones; see his dissertation on the Chronology of the Hindūs written in 1788 (AR, 2. 111, reprint of 1799). But he took a different starting-point, which he fixed in a different way.

<sup>2</sup> Bhandarkar's *Report* for 1883-84. 150, 456.



(see page 20 above) a king Kṛishṇa, with the date of A.D. 959. Ranna gives us<sup>1</sup> a king Āhavamalla, reigning in A.D. 983. A later Sōmadēva gives us (IA, 10. 75) a Bhōja, ruling in the Kōlhāpūr territory in A.D. 1205. And Jñānēśvara gives us<sup>2</sup> a Rāmachandra, reigning in A.D. 1290; while another work (see IA, 21. 51) gives a date for the same king in A.D. 1297, and shows that the Koṅkaṇ was a part of his dominions.

In the way of definite names with uncertain dates, we should have from Jahlaṇa (see page 20 above) another king Kṛishṇa, with his predecessors Mallugi, Bhillama, and Siṅghaṇa, whom we could not place in any particular period from his information alone. And we should have from Hēmādri (see page 20 f. above) a much longer list, in which we should recognize the same names, without, however, here again the means of referring them to any particular period. We should probably obtain the right clue here from the fact that Hēmādri elsewhere mentions, as the successor of his king Mahādēva, a Rāmachandra who, we should guess, ought to be identified with the Rāmachandra of A.D. 1290 and 1297. But in the case of Bāṇa's Harsha (Harshavardhana) and Bilhaṇa's Vikramāditya, we should in all probability go completely wrong: the temptation would be almost irresistible to identify Vikramāditya either with a Vikramāditya who is mentioned in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, 2. 5, 6, as a contemporary of Pratāpāditya of Kashmīr in the asserted period 180 to 148 B.C., or else with the Vikramāditya of Ujjain of the Vikrama-legend (see page 4 above, and note 2), who is supposed according to one version to have died, according to another to have begun to reign, in 58 B.C., and to identify Harsha with a certain Harsha-Vikramāditya, king of Ujjain, who is mentioned in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, 3. 125 ff., as a contemporary of Hiranya and Mātṛigupta of Kashmīr in the asserted period A.D. 76 to 111.

We should look in vain in the Purāṇas for any of the names obtained from the literature and the Paṭṭāvalis. But we should, to the best of our ability, work those names, and the dates connected with them, into the list obtained from the Purāṇas and in continuation of it. And we should possibly be working into it also some quite modern inventions, such as those of the bards of Kāthiāwār (see F.GI, introd., 49), which were at one time supposed to be 'old-world tales,' but which really sprang into existence some quarter of a century ago; and owe their

<sup>1</sup> Rice's *Kaṇṇāṭakaśābdānuśāsanam*, introd., 28.

<sup>2</sup> See *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, i, part 2. 250.



origin only to certain modern speculations which had found their way to the bards through an educational treatise.

In this way we should build up a chronological list of the rulers of India, and of some of its provinces, with 1260 B.C. as a starting-point. Then, sooner or later, we should be met by the discovery that Chandragupta, the grandfather of Aśōka, was known to the Greeks as Sandrokkottos, and that his initial date is fixed very closely about 320 B.C. by the Greek writers. We should thus learn that Aśōka could not be placed before about 265 B.C.<sup>1</sup> All the early part of our arrangements would be upset by a thousand years. And the subject would become a maze of bewilderment, confusion, and speculation, to be approached afresh from an entirely new point of view.

Fortunately, the discovery about Chandragupta was made and announced in 1793 by Sir William Jones<sup>2</sup>, before speculation into the ancient history of India had gone very far; and, fortunately, a few of the inscriptions had already begun to come to notice. From that time, more and more attention was paid to them; particularly from the time when they were taken in hand by Mr. James Prinsep, who first succeeded in deciphering the records of Aśōka, and, in that and other ways, laid the real foundations of the whole superstructure that has been subsequently reared up. And it is with relief that we turn to the inscriptions, and lay aside any further consideration of the position in which we should have found ourselves without them.

### *III. The Materials on which the Inscriptions have been recorded*

We have explained and illustrated the value of the Indian inscriptions. We come now to the consideration of the nature of them, from two points of view; as regards the materials on which they have been recorded, and as regards the topics of them.

It will be convenient to take first the materials on which the inscriptions have been recorded. These divide themselves into two leading categories; of metals, and of other substances than metal.

<sup>1</sup> With the initial date of Chandragupta in 320 B.C., Aśōka reigned from 264 to 227 B.C. (see JRAS, 1906. 984 ff.). He then (see *ibid.*, 1904. 355) abdicated, and passed into religious retirement, as a Buddhist monk, in a cell on the mountain Suvarṇagiri, SōngIr, one of the hills surrounding the ancient city Girivraja in Magadha, Bihār.

<sup>2</sup> AR, 4. Anniversary Discourse, 13, reprint of 1798.



## A. Metals

### 1. Iron

Amongst the inscriptions on metal, there is one that stands out by itself, in respect of the peculiarity of having been incised on iron. It is the short poem, constituting the epitaph of the Gupta king Chandragupta II. (F.GI, 139), which was composed in or about A.D. 415; and was placed on record on the iron column, measuring 23 ft. 8 inches in height, and estimated to weigh more than six tons, which stands at Meharauli near Delhi.

The iron pillar itself is not unique. There is another, in fragments, which was apparently nearly twice the height of the Meharauli column, at Dhār in Central India. But, while the Dhār column bears a Persian inscription of Akbar, incised in A.D. 1591-92, and a few names and letters in Nāgarī as well as Persian characters, there is no original record on it, placed there when it was set up.

### 2. Gold and Silver

On gold, we have a short Buddhist votive inscription from one of the Stūpas or relic-mounds at Gangu near Sir-Sukh in the Punjab<sup>1</sup> (ASI, 2. 130).

On silver, we have a short record, not yet deciphered, from the Stūpa at Bhaṭṭiprōlu in the Kistna District of Madras (ASSI, 6. 13); and another, apparently dedicatory, on a small disc which was found in a Stūpa at Mānikiala in the Rāwal-piṇḍī District of the Punjab (ASI. 2. 160).

### 3. Brass

Records on brass are more numerous. Amongst them we may mention prominently the following:—

From a Stūpa at Wardak in Afghānistān, we have a brass relic-vase with an inscription the date of which falls in 6 B.C. (*Ariana Antiqua*, 118; JRAS, 1863. 255).

From Kōsam near Allahābād, we have an inscribed brass seal-ring, apparently of the Gupta period (ASI, 10. plate 2, No. 4).

From somewhere near Gayā, we have a brass image of Buddha, bearing on its pedestal an inscription which, marking

<sup>1</sup> It must be explained that 'Punjab' is the prescribed official form of the name which, otherwise, it is customary to present as 'Punjab.' There may perhaps be noticed in this chapter a few other place-names, in respect of which comments might be made.



the image as a votive gift, is also of special interest in presenting a specimen of the nail-headed alphabet (IA, 19. 77).

And from the Chambā State there have been obtained some brass images, bearing inscriptions which give the names both of the king who caused them to be made and of the workmen who made them<sup>1</sup>.

#### 4. Bronze

On bronze, we have some interesting stamps for making seals (JRAS, 1901. 98, plate, Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12, 14; 1905. 814, plate, Nos. 17 to 20); and one of them (No. 20) is of particular interest in presenting its legend in three classes of characters, Brāhmī, Kharōshthī or Kharōshtrī<sup>2</sup>, and Greek.

We also have a bronze head, obtained at Peshāwar, bearing round the base of it an inscription, which cannot be deciphered fully from the illustration of it, but seems to mark it as a votive offering (JASB, 5, 1836. 484, and plate 26).

The majority of the seals attached to the copperplate records mentioned farther on—at any rate, the more elaborate ones, of later date—must probably be held to be in reality of bronze: casting in copper would hardly have brought out the details of the devices and legends so completely.

And skilled examination would perhaps stamp as being of bronze, rather than copper, the signet-ring of the Mahārāja Mahēśvaranāga which is noticed on page 31 below.

#### 5. Copper

For the most part, however, the known inscriptions on metal were placed on sheets of copper, ranging in size from about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches by  $1\frac{7}{8}$  inches in the case of a small and very early record obtained at Sōhgaurā in the Gōrakhpūr District, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh (JRAS, 1907. 509), to as much as about 2 ft. 6 inches square in the case of a record of 46 B.C. obtained at Suē-Vihār in the neighbourhood of Bahāwalpur in the Punjab (IA, 10. 324; 11. 128).

Some of these records on copper were commemorative and dedicatory, and were deposited inside the erections—relic-mounds, and, in the case of the Suē-Vihār plate, a tower—to which they belonged.

<sup>1</sup> *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India for 1902-3.* 242; see also ASI, 14. plate 28.

<sup>2</sup> It is usual to follow Professor Bühler in using the form 'Kharōshthī.' But it is by no means certain that M. Sylvain Lévi is not right in holding that the real name of these characters is 'Kharōshtrī.'



The usual copper record, however, was a donative charter, in fact a title-deed, and passed, as soon as it was issued, into private personal custody. And many of the known records of this class have come to notice through being produced by the modern possessors of them before official authorities, in the expectation of establishing privileges which (it is hardly necessary to say) have long since ceased to exist through the lapse of time, the dying out of families of original holders, rights of conquest, and the many changes of government that have taken place. It is, therefore, in private hands that we must still look to find the majority of those that remain extant but unknown. But others have been found buried in fields, and hidden in the walls and foundations of buildings. And the decay of old erections, and the excavation of ancient sites, may at any time yield a rich harvest in this direction.

A point that must always be borne in mind in connexion with these donative records on copper is that many of them have, in the course of time, passed from hand to hand and place to place, so as to have been discovered, like coins, inscribed gems, seals, seal-stamps, images, and other portable articles, in localities far distant from those to which they really belong. We have a pointed instance of this in the so-called Vakkalēri plates (EI, 5. 200). They contain a charter issued by the Western Chalukya king Kīrtivarman II. in A.D. 757. The grant was made when the king was encamped at a place specified in the record itself as Bhaṇḍāragaviṭṭage, on the north bank of the river Bhīmarathī; that is (see EI, 6. additions and corrections, A), at the modern Bhaṇḍār-Kauṭhēm, on the north bank of the Bhīmā, about twenty miles south-west from Sholāpūr in the Bombay Presidency. And probably the plates were prepared and issued at that place, and were sent thence to the donee by a special officer, frequently mentioned in other similar records as the Dūtaka, 'the messenger.' But, whatever may have been the case in that respect, the charter conveyed a village named Sulliyūr, situated in the immediate vicinity of Hāngal in the Dhārwar District. And the grantee must have resided somewhere there, on or close to the property that was given to him; and he must have had the record there in his possession, for production in case his title to the property should ever be questioned. The plates, however, eventually found their way to, and came to light from, the village of Vakkalēri in a distant part of Mysore.

The result of this peculiarity is as follows. A stone record



almost invariably establishes the sovereignty or other jurisdiction, at the place itself where it stands, of any king, etc., by whose orders or in whose time it was drawn up. But, in the case of a copper charter, any such question usually depends entirely upon a successful identification of any places mentioned in it; and the find-places of such records frequently do not help us at all in this matter, except in indicating localities in which we may look first in the process of identification. To emphasize the point, and to prevent constantly occurring misconceptions, we shall have, some day, to rename all the copper records more precisely. The so-called Vakkalēri plates would be more correctly described as the Sulliyūr grant: as regards its historical bearing, it is the country round Hāṅgal in the Dhārwar District, Bombay, not the Kōlār District in Mysore, which this record places in the territory of Kīrti-varman II. Another pointed case is that of the seal of the Maukhari king Śarvavarman (F.GI, 219), which was found at Asīrgaṛh in the Nimār District, Central Provinces, some fifty miles to the south of the Narbadā: it is unmistakably a record of Northern India; and it had no original connexion with the locality in which it was found.

It may be added that, in view of the nature of the purport of nearly all the records on copper, epigraphists are in the habit of speaking of them as 'grants,' using the term 'inscriptions' more particularly in connexion with the records on stone. But, as will be made clear in the next section, there is no radical difference in nature, such as might be inferred from this difference in nomenclature, between the records of the two classes. The inscriptions on stone are for the most part donative charters, just as is the case with the large majority of the inscriptions on metal. On the other hand, some of the copper records are, like some of the stone records, simply commemorative or dedicatory.

The copper records call themselves sometimes *paṭṭikā*, 'a tablet, a plate' (e.g., EI. I. 7, line 51), and sometimes *tāmra-paṭṭikā*, 'a copper tablet' (e.g., IA, 5. 52, line 34). But the expression more usually met with is either *śāsana*, 'a charter' (e.g., F.GI, 240, line 61), or *tāmra-śāsana*, 'a copper charter' (e.g., F.GI, 108, line 10). The term *triphalī-tāmra-śāsana*, 'a triplicate copper charter,' is found (EI, 3. 345) in the case of three separate records which are copies of each other, except only in respect of the specification of the different villages conveyed by them. And two instances are known (IA, 13. 121, line 21; H.SII, I. 151, line 89) of the use of the



term *prafasti*, 'a eulogy,' which is elsewhere found only in connexion with records on stone.

The plates on which these inscriptions were incised vary greatly in the number of the leaves, in the size and shape of them, and in the arrangement of the records on them; partly, of course, according to the lengths of individual records, but also according to particular customs and fashions prevalent in different parts of the country and in different periods of time. In some cases a single plate was used; and it was inscribed sometimes on only one side of it, sometimes on both. More often, however, more plates than one were used; and the number ranges up to as many as eleven in the case of the Kaśākūḍi record of the Pallava king Pallavamalla-Nandivarman, of some time about A.D. 733 to 747 (H.SII, 2. 342). When more plates than two were used, they were sometimes numbered (e.g., IA, 5. 50, 154, 176; 7. 191; EI, 1. 2; 5. 106; 6. 84, 315; 8. 143, 159). In a few records on stone, the lines were numbered (e.g., PSOCI, Nos. 116, 124, 141, 192); but no instance can be cited of that having been done in the case of a record on metal.

In the case of records on copper covering more plates than one, it was customary to string the plates together by one or two copper rings, passing through round holes in them; much after the fashion in which the leaves of Indian manuscripts are strung together by threads.

#### c. Seals of Copperplate Records

It was also customary that such of the records on copper as were donative charters should be authenticated. And the most usual method of giving the authentication was by attaching a copper or bronze reproduction of the royal seal.

This emblem of sovereignty and power, whether in the shape of an actual seal made from a stamp, or in the shape of a stamp or a signet-ring for making a seal, no doubt played in India quite as important a part, in many ways, as it has always played in other eastern lands and in the west. And, in support of our belief, we may appropriately quote the following instances. In one direction, in the line of romance, a dexterous use of the royal signet was made by Kālidāsa, in his well-known play, the plot of which hinges upon the recognition of his wife Śakuntalā by king Dushyanta being evoked by the sight of the ring which he had given her, incised with the letters of his name. So also, the signet-ring of the fugitive minister, with his name engraved upon it, plays a part



in the *Mudrārākshasa*. In another direction, in the line of practical affairs, we learn from the *Life* of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsiang (Julien, 260; Beal, 190) that, when he finally took leave of king Harshavardhana of Thāṇēsar and Kanauj, the king furnished him with letters, written on fine white cotton stuff and certified by impressions of his seal made in red wax, which the officers of his escort were to present in all the countries through which they conducted the Master, to the end that the princes of those countries should provide carriages or other means of conveyance for the Master even to the borders of China.

And to the seal of Harshavardhana there is another allusion, in the *Harshacharita* of Bāṇa, which is worth citing, not only because it is a happy one, but also because it is instructive in mentioning another manner in which it was customary to make the seal; namely, by stamping it on a ball or disc of clay. The Hebrews seem to have made seals in the same way: 'it is turned as clay to the seal,' or 'it is changed as clay under the seal' (Job xxxviii. 14). And the backs and other parts of some extant specimens of Indian clay seals show distinctly the lines and the graining of the palms of the hands in which the clay was held in making the impressions<sup>1</sup>.

The passage in question in the *Harshacharita* (Kashmīr edition, 430; and see the translation by Cowell and Thomas, 198) sets out that, when king Harshavardhana was about to make his expedition against the king of Gauda, a starting-point was selected, and a temporary encampment was made, at a suitable place, not far from his capital, on the bank of the river Sarasvatī. There the Grāmākshapaṭalika, or keeper of the village-records, came before the king, and asked him to issue the orders for the day, and presented a newly made golden stamp (*mudrā*), bearing the device of a bull, wherewith he was to make a seal authenticating the orders. As soon, however, as a ball or disc of clay was produced for that purpose, the stamp slipped from the king's hand; and fell face downwards upon some almost dry black mire which served as an inking-pad, and then rolled onto a spot of soft clay. And so the lines of letters of the legend on the stamp were distinctly marked on the bank of the river. The bystanders saw in that a bad omen. But the king deduced from it the auspicious augury, that the whole earth should be stamped with the single seal of his sole command.

<sup>1</sup> See JRS, 1901. 103; also *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India* for 1903-4. 101.



Here, plainly, Harshavardhana was to have used, not a signet-ring, but a stamp of the same kind with some which have been mentioned on page 26 above, under the heading of inscriptions on bronze.

Indian kings, princes, and high ministers, however, used also signet-rings, with which they could make their seals as occasion might require, or, of course, which they might themselves exhibit when necessary, or might entrust to others to be used as a voucher or token. Not only do we gather that from the Abhijñānaśakuntala and the Mudrārākshasa, but also we have an actual specimen of such a ring, referable to the fourth century A.D., which was obtained at Lahore (F.G.I., 282). That specimen is an exaggerated signet-ring, made of copper or bronze, closely resembling the ordinary English pattern, and of the kind which may still be seen worn loosely on the thumbs of ministers of Native States. From the flat surface of the signet to the bottom of the ring, it is about  $1\frac{1}{4}$  inches high. The surface of the signet is about  $\frac{1}{16}$  inch thick, and is slightly oval in shape, about  $1\frac{7}{8}$  by  $1\frac{5}{8}$  inches. On it there is a legend, in two lines, of which the purport is: 'The Mahārāja Mahēśvaranāga, son of Nāga-bhaṭṭa;' above the legend, and separated from it by a line serving the same purpose with the bar which usually stands below the heraldic device on an English signet-ring, there is a bull couchant, with a crescent moon; and below the legend there is a snake. The legend is in reverse in the original; and both it and the devices are sunk in the surface of the signet. Accordingly, if pressed, uninked, on some soft substance, this signet-ring would bring out the legend and devices in relief on a plain flat ground. If inked and then pressed on such a substance, it would bring them out in white relief on a black ground; as, we are to understand, was done by Harshavardhana's stamp according to Bāṇa. If inked and pressed on some hard substance, or on cloth stretched tight<sup>1</sup>, it would bring them out in white on a black field.

This custom of thus attaching the royal authentication to charters has given us a large and highly interesting series of ancient Indian seals, some of them presenting devices only, others only legends, and others both legends and devices, and some of them being of an extremely elaborate kind. And

<sup>1</sup> For mention of the stamping of cloth fabrics, by way of ornamentation, but apparently not exactly in this fashion, see the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, I. 294 f., 299.



CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

from various statements in the records we know that the soil or the principal device, as the case may be, was almost always the *lāñchhana* or crest, which was usually different from the device emblazoned on the *dhvaja* or banner (see F.DKD, 299, note 4). The same device, the crest, was used on coins also, and sometimes with inscriptions on stone. And it usually took the form of some animal; a bull, a boar, a lion, a tiger, a fish, the bird-man Garuḍa, the monkey-god Hanumat, and so on. It was probably largely used on shields also, though at present there can be cited to that effect only one indication, which is found in an inscription on stone at Baḷagāmi in Mysore (PSOCI, No. 205); in the sculptures, showing a battle-scene, in the bottom compartment of that stone, the shields on the right side distinctly bear animals, which are apparently in one case a lion and in the other a boar.

In the case of records on single plates, it was customary to weld or otherwise fasten the seals on to the plates themselves; sometimes at the left side, before the lines of the inscription (e.g., F.GI, 256; IA, 15. 112, 140; EI, 6. 133, 140), and sometimes at the top (e.g., JASB, 47, 1878. 384; 63, 1894. 58). For some instances of seals which were once attached in this way, but have become separated from the plates to which they belonged, reference may be made to the fine Bhitari seal of Kumāragupta II. (JASB, 58, 1889. 85), and to the still more elaborate Aśīgarh seal of the Maukhari king Śarvavarman (F.GI, 220). We have also a seal of Harshavardhana, from Sōnpat (F.GI, 230); but it is not in the same excellent state of preservation.

In the case of charters consisting of more plates than one, the seal was treated in another manner, and was made to serve as a safeguard in addition to being a mark of authentication. This was effected by attaching it to the single ring when there was only one, and to one of the two rings when there were two. And the usual process seems to have been, first to rivet or otherwise join the ends of the ring, and then to cast the seal over the joint, so that the component parts of the record could not be separated without intentionally severing the rings. The result is that most of the seals attached to the charters in this way imitate the shape of exaggerated signet-rings, of varying sizes. But, together with the seals fixed on to the plates themselves, they represent real seals, not reversed stamps for making seals. As has been mentioned on page 26 above, probably they are for the most part of bronze, rather than of copper.



In this class of seals, for some which bear devices only, reference may be made to the plates at IA, 5. 50; 6. 23; 7. 39, 161, 252; 8. 27, 44; 9. 35, 103, 124; 11. 112, 126, 161; 12. 160; EI, 2. 352; 3. 104, 276; 4. 244; JBBRAS, 15. 386; B.ESIP, 106. For some seals with legends only, see the plates at F.GI, 108, 234; EI, 3. 261; 4. 244. And, for some seals with both legends and devices, see the plates at F.GI, 128, 169, 194, 198, 296; IA, 1. 16; 6. 25, 33; 7. 17, 190, 253; 8. 47, 320; 12. 93, 267; 13. 137, 249; 18. 234; 19. 310; EI, 2. 364; 3. 104; 4. 244; 6. 294; JRAS, 1865. 247; JASB. 86, 1897. 124; B.ESIP, 106. Some of the references given above illustrate clearly also the various shapes of rings and diverse methods of attaching the seals to them.

Sometimes an additional authentication was given by what purported to be more or less an autograph signature of the king or prince from whom a charter emanated, usually introduced by words meaning either 'this is the own hand of me' or 'this is the pleasure of me.' The signature is sometimes in characters of the same class with those used in the body of the record (e.g., IA, 6. 19, 193; 16. 202, 206; EI, 1. 317; 4. 210; 6. 294), and sometimes in different characters (e.g., IA, 13. 79; 14. 210; PSOCI, No. 282). Occasionally it is accompanied by marks evidently intended to represent some kind of a sign-manual (e.g., IA, 6. 19; 14. 201; EI, 6. 294).

There are a few cases in which an image was employed instead of a seal. The ends of the ring on which were strung the Khārēpāṭaṇ plates, bearing the record of the Śilāhāra prince Raṭṭarāja of A.D. 1008, were welded into the base of a small image of Garuḍa (EI, 3. 301). In the case of the Paithāṇ record of A.D. 1272 of the Dēvagiri-Yādava king Rāmachandra (IA, 14. 314), on a plain ring which holds the plates together there slides another ring which is let into the back of an image of Garuḍa about  $8\frac{1}{2}$  inches high. In the case of the Kamauli plates of king Vaidyadēva of Prāgyōtisha, an image of Gaṇapati is ensconced in a spoon-shaped receptacle which secured the ring on which the plates were strung (EI, 2. 352).

The Paithāṇ record of A.D. 1272, mentioned in the preceding paragraph, is an epigraphic curiosity in respect of its weight. It is on three plates, each measuring about 1 ft. 3 inches in width by 1 ft.  $8\frac{1}{2}$  inches in height, which are so massive as to weigh 59 lb. 2 oz.; and the weight of the ring on which they were strung, and of the image of Garuḍa which was secured to it by the other ring, is 11 lb. 12 oz. Thus, the total weight



CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh  
of this title-deed, which conveyed a village to fifty-seven  
Brāhman, is no less than 70 lb. 14 oz.; appreciably more than  
half a hundredweight.

### B. Other Substances than Metal

The inscriptions on other substances than metal are found on crystal; on clay, sometimes left to harden naturally, sometimes apparently hardened by some artificial means, and sometimes baked into terra-cotta or burnt into brick; on earthenware; and on stone in various forms. Inscribed wooden tablets and strips of leather secured by clay seals have been obtained in Central Asia; but it is not known that any such have been as yet found in India.

For the most part, whatever happened to be the material used, the records of this class were executed by engraving

We have, however, a few written with ink on earthenware; from Bhōjpur, Sāñchi, and Andhēr in Central India (pages 40, 44, 45, below); from Chārsada in the North-West Frontier Province (page 40); and from Hidda in Afghānistān (*Ariana Antiqua*, 111, and 262, plate). Of these, the instances from Central India are the earliest, and are probably to be referred to the second or third century B.C.

And from the Ginja hill, in either the Allahābād District or the Rewah State, we have an inscription recorded by paint on a rock (ASI, 21. 119, and plate 30; EI, 3. 306, plate): it mentions a Mahārāja named Bhīmasēna; and it presents a date which places it either in A.D. 371 or in 5 B.C.<sup>1</sup> Other painted inscriptions, executed in that manner as an accompaniment to frescoes, have been found in the Buddhist caves at Ajanṭā in the Nizam's Dominions (ASWI, 4. 136, and plate 59).

In the case of votive tablets made of clay, the custom was to use incised stamps, prepared of course in reverse; with the result that, on the tablets on which the stamps were impressed the inscriptions, as well as any devices accompanying them, stand out in relief. And the results are the same in the case of clay seals, made from reversed metal dies or from anything in the shape of a stone matrix.

The inscriptions on brick were either incised with a stylus, or stamped with a die, before the clay was burnt into brick.

<sup>1</sup> This may seem rather a wide range of doubt. The fact is that we require a better reproduction of the record, to enable us to appreciate it properly and arrive at any decisive opinion as to its period.



In the case of inscriptions on stone, the devices and symbols, dynastic, religious, and of other kinds, which accompany some of them in Northern India and a large number of them in Southern India, were in the earliest instances incised in outline; but they were nearly always sculptured in relief from the time, the seventh century, when the use of them began to be frequent, and the nature of them became more or less elaborate. The records themselves, however, of the period covered by this account, were but rarely treated so. The Musalmān inscriptions were, it is believed, nearly always carved in relief. And various Hindū inscriptions were done in the same way in the Musalmān period. But only one instance of a record prepared in that way, otherwise than on metal, can as yet be cited for the earlier period; it is an inscription on the pedestal of an image of Buddha, of the Gupta period, found in excavations recently made at Sārnāth<sup>1</sup>.

We have noted, on page 28 above, certain names by which some of the copperplate records designate themselves. Amongst the records on stone, some of the edicts of Aśōka style themselves *dharmma-lipi*, 'a writing of religion.' Various other records mention themselves by such names as *śilā-śāsana*, 'a stone charter;' *śilā-lēkha*, 'a stone writing;' and *praśasti*, 'a eulogy.' And other terms which occur are *śāsana*, 'a charter' (EI, 3. 5, line 19); *kallu-śāsana*, 'a stone charter' (EC, 3. Nj, 139, line 29); and *vīra-śāsana*, 'a charter or record of heroism' (PSOCI, No. 191; EC, 7. Sk, 144, last line).

We have also, on page 27 above, mentioned, and indicated the necessity of bearing in mind, the liability to travel, which has led to some of the copper charters being found in localities far distant from those to which they really belong. Records on stone were necessarily not so much liable to leave their original sites. But it is known (see ASI, 1. 161; 5. 143; 14. 78; JRAS, 1906. 407) that the two columns, bearing edicts of Aśōka, which now stand at Delhi, were brought there in the latter half of the fourteenth century under the orders of Firōz Shāh Tughlak; one from Meerut, and the other from Barā Topra, in the Ambālā District, some fifty miles from the Siwālik Hills. And it is supposed that the similar column which stands at Allahābād was originally set up at Kauśāmbī; because it bears, in addition to other records, an order of Aśōka addressed to the officials of Kauśāmbī. Also, it may be added, the opinion has been expressed that the inscribed iron pillar

<sup>1</sup> See *Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey, Northern Circle*, 1905-6. 33.



which stands at Meharauli, near Delhi (see page 25 above) may have been taken to that place from Muttra.

### 1. Crystal

Only one record on crystal, which may be classed as an inscription, can be cited; evidently, the material was found too hard for any general use to be made of it in the inscriptional line. The record in question is scratched, rather than engraved, on the six faces, each about  $\frac{3}{8}$  inch in breadth, of an hexagonal piece of crystal, measuring about  $2\frac{1}{4}$  inches in breadth, and probably, as it is pierced by a hole through its axis, originally used for suspending round the neck as an amulet, which was found in the remains of a Buddhist Stūpa or relic-mound at Bhāṭṭiprōlu in the Kistna District of Madras (EI, 2. 324, plate; ASSI, 6. 11, and plates 1, 4, 5). The purport of the inscription (EI, 2. 329) is not at all certain; it may perhaps register a votive offering, made by a woman from a town named Nadapura, Nandapura, in recognition of recovery from a serious illness.

Along with many other articles, two crystal phials and one crystal casket were found in the Bhāṭṭiprōlu deposit; but there are no inscriptions on them, or on crystal articles found in similar deposits elsewhere. In connexion, however, with some of those articles, other expedients were adopted, to mark the nature of them, or to record the dedication of them.

A crystal relic-casket was found in the Stūpa No. 2 at Sōnārī, in the neighbourhood of the well-known Sāñchi in the Bhōpāl State, Central India. The casket itself was not inscribed. But inside it there was deposited a piece of stone, about  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch long by  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch broad, bearing an inscription on the front and back (C.BT, 121, 316, and plate 24, 'box' No. 1). The purport of the inscription (JRAS, 1905. 687) is: '(Relics) of the sainted (literally, the good man) Gotiputa-Dudubhisara (or Duṁḍubhisara), of the Himavat region, an heir of the faith.' This record gives us an historic name, of one of the four companions of Kotiputta-Kassapagotta, the missionary who (see page 44 below) was sent to the Himālayas by Moggaliputta-Tissa, in the time of Aśōka; and it helps to furnish valuable corroboration of the account of that mission given in the Dīpavaṁsa, 8. 10.

A crystal casket, obtained from the remains of a Stūpa at Kōlhāpūr in the Bombay Presidency, was found inside a stone box. Here, again, the crystal casket was not inscribed; but on the lid of the stone box there was engraved an inscription



(ASWI, No. 10, Cave-Temple Inscriptions, 39, and plate No. 1) to the purport: 'The gift of Bamha; caused to be made by Dhamaguta.'

## 2. Clay, Terra-cotta, and Brick

In various parts of India there are found, in large numbers, small inscribed tablets of clay, sometimes baked into terra-cotta, sometimes left to harden naturally. These tablets are called, as a matter of convenience, sometimes seals, sometimes discs; but neither term is exactly appropriate. The latter because these tablets are not uniformly round in shape: some of them are oval; others, rectangular. The former, because, for the most part, the nature of them is not such as to answer to any ordinary meaning of the word seal: they were mostly votive offerings.

The best-known instances of these tablets are Buddhist, and bear the verse, the so-called formula or creed, which (see the *Vinayapitaka*, ed. Oldenberg, 1. 40) was pronounced by Assaji, one of the earliest followers of Buddha, and led to the conversion of those two persons, Sāriputta-Upatissa and Moggallāna-Kōlita, who became the chief disciples of Buddha. Sāriputta had asked Assaji who his teacher was, and what might be the essence of his doctrine. And Assaji replied: 'Of those conditions which spring from a cause, Tathāgata (Buddha) has declared the cause and the suppression of them; it is of such matters that he, the great Samāṇa, discourses.'

Of these votive tablets, some present the verse only (see, for instance, ASI, 11. plate 12, No. 13). Others exhibit with the verse a representation of a Stūpa (*ibid.*, No. 12). Others exhibit, one or more Stūpas and perhaps a num-

































































































































































































































































able traces of Hindu influence, and many are almost as much Hindu as Muhammadan in style. The marks of Hindu workmanship are, indeed, so apparent that several writers long contended even for the Hindu origin of the famous Kutb Minār near Delhi. But Sir Alexander Cunningham has demonstrated that this noble tower 'is entirely a Muhammadan one both as to origin and design; although, no doubt, many, perhaps all, of the beautiful details of the richly decorated balconies may be Hindu.' It was undoubtedly built as the *mazinah*, or minaret, for the proclamation of the call to prayers at the great mosque close by, which was itself constructed from the spoils of twenty-seven Hindu and Jain temples. The Minār, erected by Altamsh (not by Kutb-ud-dīn Aibak), was probably completed about A.D. 1230, which is the date of an inscription on the adjoining mosque. Repairs were effected by Firoz Shāh Tughlak in the fourteenth century. The pillars of the mosque were taken bodily out of the idol temples and roughly adapted to serve their new purpose. They naturally retain most of their old ornamentation, which contrasts strangely with the great Saracenic arches. The same procedure was adopted in many other places, and numerous mosques display an odd combination of Perso-Saracenic arches and cupolas with Hindu architrave construction and mediaeval ornament. The specially Indian ornaments of the earlier Muhammadan buildings need not detain us. They comprise geometrical patterns and floral devices in great variety, exactly the same as those found in innumerable temples at Khajurāho, Mount Abu, and in fact all over India.

But Indian ornament was supplemented, and ultimately displaced, by foreign forms of decoration, the history of which is worth tracing in some detail. One of the most characteristic ornaments of Muhammadan buildings in India is mosaic or inlay in various forms. In the earliest examples, of which Alā-ud-dīn's gateway on the south side of the Kutb mosque, erected in the year A.D. 1310, is the most notable, the inlay is confined to broad bands of white marble set in the red sandstone, and has a very pretty effect. The exterior of the tomb of Tughlak Shāh at Delhi, built in 1321, is decorated in the same severe style, which is seen in a more developed form in the Kila Kohna mosque built at Delhi by Sher Shāh (A.D. 1541-2).

Mother-of-pearl is combined with marble on the tomb of Ahmad Shāh's queen at Ahmadābād (A.D. 1430), and is also used on the wooden canopy of the tomb of the saint Salīm Chishti at Fatehpur Sikri, applied as a tessellated incrustation of



delicate design (A.D. 1571). Akbar's great mosque at Fatehpur Sikri, erected in the same year, in imitation of a mosque at Mecca, is freely decorated with white marble mosaics of Arabian and Persian geometric patterns, occasionally varied by the insertion of blue and green enamel. A fine mosaic pavement is to be seen at the Rayan Angan palace at Udaipur, of the same date. All these early mosaics of different kinds were immediately derived from Asiatic models.

But, during the reign of Jahāngīr, the European artists and craftsmen then in the service of the Great Mogul introduced the Florentine, or *pietra dura*, style of mosaic, which during the reign of Shāh Jahān (A.D. 1627-58) almost superseded the older styles.

The Florentine mosaic, a revival of the ancient *opus sectile*, first appears in the Fabbrica Ducale built by Ferdinand I, Grand Duke of Tuscany, in 1558. It is composed of thin sections of hard stones (*pietra dura*), such as jasper, carnelian, and agate, cut to the shapes required, and neatly bedded in the masonry with cement. This style of mosaic, when executed by capable workmen, can be applied in the most various patterns, and is of an extremely decorative character.

The earliest imitation in India of the Florentine work is to be seen in the bold floral mosaics on Akbar's mausoleum at Sikandra near Agra, executed about A.D. 1613. But the first closely accurate copy of Italian *pietra dura* mosaic is ten years later in date and occurs in the Gol Mahāl, a domed pavilion in the Jagmandir palace at Udaipur. Shāh Jahān, while still known as Prince Khurram and in rebellion against his father, resided as a fugitive in this very building a year or two after the execution of the mosaics, and thus probably acquired his strong liking for the Italian mode of decoration. All travellers who have visited Agra and Delhi are familiar with the exquisite *pietra dura* decorations of the Tāj, of the tomb of Itimād-ud-daula, and of the royal palaces erected during Shāh Jahān's reign. Practitioners of the art settled in Agra, where it flourished for a considerable time as long as it was supported by court patronage. But when the imperial court dwindled to a shadow, the arts which depended upon it dwindled also, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Agra craftsmen had almost forgotten their ancient skill in *pietra dura*. The exertions of Dr. Murray, Inspector-General of Hospitals about 1830, revived the art, and the now numerous cold-season visitors to Agra buy enough to keep a moderate number of workmen engaged in producing commonplace articles. High-



class work is necessarily so expensive that the demand for it is very small. The localization of this pretty handicraft in Agra is a good example of the benefits which the Indian arts have so often gained by intercourse with outside nations and the importation of foreign ideas and designs.

The fine sepulchre of Jahāngīr near Lahore (A.D. 1627-8), which is much less familiar to tourists than the buildings at Agra and Delhi, is remarkable for its display of 'all the resources of inlaying in marble, stone, and pottery, lavished on the central tomb. There is no structure in India which presents so many classes of mosaic work as this' (Cole). These classes comprise black and white panels filled with outlines of flagons and other objects, executed in a style possessing dignity without excessive severity; zigzag bands of variegated marbles and coloured stones; mosaics in geometrical patterns; *pietra dura* work in the Florentine fashion; and mosaics in enamelled tiles.

The art of embellishing buildings by the application of enamelled tiles was derived, through Persia, from the old-world craftsmen of Assyria and Babylonia. It was introduced into India by the Muhammadan invaders during the twelfth century, and from that time was frequently employed with great effect. Good early examples of this form of decoration are to be seen at Multān on the tombs of Bahā-ul-hakk and Rukn-ud-dīn, dating from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The colours employed are dark blue, azure, and white. Tiles of green, yellow, and blue colour were used extensively to adorn the palace of the Hindu Rāja, Mān Singh, at Gwalior, which was built at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The floral patterns executed in green, yellow, and blue tile mosaics on the walls of Jahāngīr's tomb (A.D. 1627-8) are extremely effective.

The most striking example in India of the use of encaustic tiles is the Chīnī-kā-Rauza near Agra, the tomb of a poet who died in A.D. 1639, which has been described and illustrated in a special study by the late Mr. E. W. Smith. The exterior of the tomb was covered from top to bottom with mosaic of tiling in a variety of colours, arranged so as to form an unbroken flat surface. This uniformity of surface led Mr. Carlyle to believe that the glazed decoration was applied, not in the form of tiles, but either in one continuous sheet or in a few very large sheets. The more searching examination of the building by Mr. E. W. Smith has, however, proved that the glazed patterns are made up of thousands of small pieces of tiles carefully embedded like mosaic into the face of the plaster. The brickwork was first



overlaid with a coat of plaster 2 inches in depth, which in its turn was covered by a finer layer 1 inch thick, and upon this the tiles,  $\frac{5}{8}$ ths of an inch thick, were bedded. The range of colours is much greater than that of the earlier examples, and includes chocolates, vermilions, and lakes, which were quite unknown in more ancient times. The art of making enamelled tiles is now nearly extinct, but is said to linger at Peshāwar and in Sind.

A rather meretricious, though pretty, form of decoration is the inlay of pieces of looking-glass, which became fashionable in the seventeenth century, and was adopted in later times by the Sikhs. The finest glass mosaics are in the palaces at Udaipur and Amber. The mirror throne in the centre of the western wall of the Udaipur palace is very brilliant, and overlooks a court to the east, the walls of which are adorned with peacocks standing in niches and executed in glass mosaic. The mirror mosaics of Shāh Jahān's 'Shish Mahal' in the Agra Fort are well known.

Painting was first used extensively as an architectural decoration by Akbar, who imported artists from Tabriz and Shirāz in Persia; but, according to Major Cole, earlier examples are to be seen on the interior of the dome of Shāh Ālam's tomb at Ahmadābād (A.D. 1475); on the walls of Mān Singh's palace at Gwalior (about A.D. 1507); and on the ceilings of the Kila Kohna mosque at Delhi (A.D. 1540).

Akbar and his successors, Jahāngīr and Shah Janān, freely invoked the aid of the painter's art, and had no hesitation in permitting the delineation of the human figure, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Korān. The paintings of the Mughal period are commonly called frescoes; but the published accounts do not give detailed information concerning the technique, and they may or may not be true frescoes in the strict sense. The most interesting specimens of the time of Akbar are to be seen, unfortunately much damaged, in the small chamber used by the emperor as his bedroom in the Fatehpur Sikri palace, and have been admirably reproduced in Mr. E. W. Smith's book. One of the best-preserved fragments represents a sailing boat, carrying Muhammadan passengers of the upper classes, running before the wind on a river passing an Indian city. Although the perspective might be better, it is not bad, while the drawing of the figures is distinctly good, and the different expressions of the various actors in the scene are vividly rendered. The style of the figures closely resembles that of the best of the miniature paintings which are still produced at Agra, but probably it would be difficult now to find



an artist there capable of designing a group equal to that in this ancient work.

Another painting in the same room is unmistakably Chinese in style, and the subject is apparently Buddhist. It is not improbable that the foreigners in attendance at the Mughal court may have included Buddhist artists from China, but, even if none such were present, the court painters would have found no difficulty in copying an imported Chinese picture. Sir Thomas Roe, the ambassador of James I at Jahāngir's court in 1615, was much struck by the facility with which foreign pictures and manufactures were copied by the craftsmen of the imperial household; and some years later, the French physician Bernier repeats the observation. As Sir George Birdwood remarks, the Hindus have 'a natural capacity for assimilating foreign forms.'

The frescoes in 'Miriam's House' at Fatehpur Sikri are as curious as those of Akbar's bedroom. One, painted on a panel over the doorway in the north-western angle of the building, has been dubbed 'the Annunciation' by the guides. The picture represents two winged angels, seemingly engaged in the delivery of a message to some person under a canopy. It is possible that the current name of the composition may be correct, but the work is so seriously damaged that the interpretation must remain doubtful. The popular notion that the queen who bore the title of 'Miriam of the Age' was a Christian is absolutely baseless. But there is no doubt that Akbar took the liveliest interest in foreign religions, and was much pleased with Christian and Buddhist pictures.

The liberality of Akbar's patronage of painters is recorded by his minister, Abul Fazl, who writes:—

'His Majesty from his earliest youth has shown a great predilection for the art, and gives it every encouragement, as he looks upon it as a means both of study and amusement. Hence the art flourishes, and many painters have obtained great reputation. The works of all painters are weekly laid before his Majesty by the *dārôghas* and the clerks; he then confers rewards according to the excellence of workmanship, or increases the monthly salaries. Much progress was made in the commodities required by painters, and the correct prices of such articles were carefully ascertained. The mixture of colours has especially been improved. The pictures thus received a hitherto unknown finish. Many excellent painters are now to be found, and masterpieces, worthy of a Bihzād [a Persian painter, who lived about A.D. 1500], may be placed by the side of the wonderful works of the European painters who have



obtained world-wide fame. The minuteness in detail, the general finish, the boldness of execution, &c., now observed in pictures are incomparable; even inanimate objects look as if they had life. More than a hundred painters have become famous masters of the art, whilst the number of those who approach perfection or of those who are middling is very large. This is especially true of Hindus; their pictures surpass our conception of things. Few indeed in the whole world are equal to them' (*Ain-i-Akbari*, sec. 34).

This interesting passage proves that the Mughal school of painting was inspired by European as well as Persian models. The comprehensiveness of the scheme of colour in the Fatehpur Sikri frescoes is clearly a result of the study of European art. Although the imitative Hindus attained conspicuous skill in the assimilation of foreign artistic methods, no genuine school of Indian painting was founded by Akbar's well-meant efforts. India has never produced an artist of original genius in either painting or sculpture; and to this day the inhabitants of Hindustān, even the most highly cultivated, are singularly indifferent to aesthetic merit, and little qualified to distinguish between good and bad art. The same defect in the Indian mind existed in the days of Akbar, and nullified his attempt to found and establish a national school of art. The pictorial decorations of the Mughal palaces, so far as they are Indian work, are merely commissions executed by clever copyists to gratify the caprices of a royal master. The art of miniature painting still lingers at Agra and Delhi, and the few craftsmen who practise it produce pretty, but feeble and lifeless works, of more interest to the curio-hunter than to the historian of art. The encouragement of artists by the Mughal emperors resulted in the production of numerous exquisitely illuminated manuscripts for the royal libraries, but of these sumptuous productions comparatively few survive. An exceptionally fine collection of works of this class has been presented by a Muhammadan gentleman to the city of Patna.

The Mughal sovereigns, following the practice of the Persian Shiah Muhammadans, who little regarded the Korānic prohibition of images, not only made free use, as we have seen, of pictures delineating human and animal forms, but occasionally summoned the aid of the sculptor's art for the decoration of their palaces. The two life-size statues of elephants with riders, originally set up at Agra, probably by Jahāngir, of which portions are preserved in the public gardens at Delhi, were the most notable efforts of the sculptors of the Mughal



period The French traveller, Bernier, who saw them in A.D. 1663, was much impressed by their merit, and observed :—

‘These two large elephants, mounted by the two heroes, have an air of grandeur, and inspire me with an awe and respect which I cannot describe<sup>1</sup>.’

The Sarai, or travellers rest-house, at Nūrmahal in the Punjab, built in the reign of Jahāngir, is remarkable for its sculptured front.

‘The whole front is divided into panels ornamented with sculpture; but the relief is low and the workmanship coarse. There are angels and fairies, elephants and rhinoceros, camels and horses, monkeys and peacocks, with men on horseback, and archers on elephants. The sides of the gateway are in much better taste, the ornament being limited to foliated scroll-work with birds sitting on the branches. But even in this the design is much better than the execution, as there is little relief<sup>2</sup>.’

In this connexion mention may be made of the unique tile work on the north and west sides of the inner wall of the Lahore Fort, believed to have been executed in the reign of Jahāngir. An enormous space, more than a quarter of a mile in length and 17 yards high, was decorated with enamelled tiles, exhibiting not only geometrical and foliated designs, but figures of living beings.

‘Many of the scenes represented possess also considerable historical interest, illustrating the life of the Mughal emperors. Several specimens represent elephant fights, which were one of the chief recreations of the Mughal court, and one of the finest panels shows four horsemen playing Chaugān or Persian polo.’

Dr. Vogel has succeeded in securing tracings of 116 panels<sup>3</sup>.

When the antiquity and high standard of Indian civilization are considered, the almost absolute non-existence of examples of the minor arts dating from past ages is astonishing. The only ancient pottery discoverable is that found in prehistoric cemeteries and megalithic tombs. With the exception of the enamelled tiles already mentioned, no examples of old Indian ceramic work with any pretension to artistic merit seem to exist, and the tiles, even if actually made in India, are essentially foreign. India never had indigenous art pottery. For ceremonial reasons Hindūs always have been in the habit of using the cheapest unglazed earthenware pots, which could be used once and then thrown away without appreciable loss.

<sup>1</sup> See Keene's *Handbook to Delhi*, App. A. These statues have recently been restored.

<sup>2</sup> Cunningham, *Reports*, xiv, 62.

<sup>3</sup> *Progress Report of Archaeol. Surveyor, Punjab*, for 1901-2.



People with such a habit had no inducement to design art ware intended for permanent preservation. But side by side with the coarse earthenware pots, Hindus, from time immemorial, have been accustomed to use vessels of metal—gold, silver, copper, brass, and other alloys. We might expect to find numerous ancient examples of metal vessels employed in domestic service or the worship of the gods, but as a matter of fact such examples are of the utmost rarity. The only really ancient domestic utensil known seems to be the engraved *lota*, or waterpot, found in 1857 in Kulū in the Punjab, and now in the Indian Museum at South Kensington. The shape of this unique vessel is exactly the same as that of the common pots now in use. Its approximate date is determined by the engraving, which consists of a processional scene treated after the manner of the Sānchī and Bharhut bas-reliefs, and indicates that the work may be attributed with some confidence to the second century B.C.

Very little of the sumptuous metal ware which served the needs of the luxurious princes and nobles of the imperial court seems to have escaped the melting-pot. Sir George Birdwood has figured a beautiful silver *hukka* bowl, decorated with transparent enamel, belonging to the Royal Collection, and dating from 'the best Mughal period,' but examples of work of that age are very rare.

The art of decorating jade vessels with gems is an invention of the Mughal period, which may have been due to either the European or the Indian jewellers in the service of the court. Two priceless specimens of this costly art—a bowl and a plume—are in the Indian Museum at South Kensington, and have been figured in Sir George Birdwood's book.

Several examples of small caskets and receptacles made of rock crystal have been found in ancient Buddhist *stūpas*. By far the most ancient, as well as the largest and most important of these, is the covered bowl which accompanied the relics of Buddha in the Piprahwa *stūpa* mentioned above. This bowl is  $3\frac{1}{4}$  in. in diameter, and, including the cover, stands  $3\frac{1}{2}$  in. high. The cover, which fits with perfect accuracy, has a handle in the shape of a fish, hollowed out, and stuffed with stars of gold-leaf. The crystal bowl and the steatite vases accompanying it are all turned on the lathe, and we thus learn that the Indian lapidaries were familiar with the use of the lathe in or about 450 B.C.

The skill of the ancient craftsmen in shaping, polishing, and piercing gems of extreme hardness, is attested for the same



remote date by the treasure accompanying the Piprahwa relics, as well as by other similar finds of later date. The combined testimony of ancient literature and archaeology proves that jewellery of an elaborate kind was used freely in India from very early times, but our knowledge of the actual forms of ancient jewellery is chiefly derived from bas-reliefs and the Ajantā paintings. The discovery a few years ago in Peshāwar District of some fine specimens of complete necklaces and pendants of complex design stands alone. These ornaments, which have been described and illustrated by Mr. Marshall, were associated with Kushān coins, and may be assigned to the third century A.D. Seals and engraved gems of varying degrees of merit have been found at many ancient Indian sites, and Dr. Stein's researches have disclosed the existence of similar objects in the ruins of the sand-buried cities of Chinese Turkistan. In that region, as in India, the best examples are Hellenistic in design.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

### AUTHORITIES

The literature of Indian Archaeology is of such enormous bulk that a complete enumeration of the items would fill a volume. The official publications of the Archaeological Survey alone comprise Cunningham's *Reports*, twenty-three volumes; Vincent Smith's *General Index* to the same, one volume; and the *Imperial Series*, about thirty volumes large quarto, by various authors; besides other series and numerous minor and miscellaneous works issued by Local Governments. Since the reorganization of the Archaeological Survey by Lord Curzon, two *Annual Reports*, for 1902-3 and 1903-4, have appeared, edited by Mr. Marshall.

The voluminous *Journals and Proceedings* of the Asiatic and Oriental Societies of England, India, and Europe, as well as the thirty-four volumes quarto of the *Indian Antiquary*, are full of innumerable articles on the subject.

The following works, not included in the regular series of *Reports*, will be found specially useful :—

CUNNINGHAM, *Bhilsa Topes; Stūpa of Bharhut; Mahābodhi*. FER-  
GUSON, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, 2nd ed., 1873 (for Sānchī and Amarā-  
vati). FERGUSON and BURGESS, *Cave Temples of India*. BURGESS,  
*Notes on the Eaudlha Rock Temples of Ajantā* (Bombay, 1879). GRIFFITHS,  
*The Paintings in the Buddhist Cave Temples of Ajantā* (two vols., atlas  
folio, London, 1896). GRÜNWEDEL, *Buddhist Art in India*, ed.  
Burgess, transl. Gibson (London, 1901; with a copious bibliography).  
FOUCHER, *L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gaudhāra* (only vol. i yet published).  
COLE, *Reports on the Preservation of National Monuments, India*, ten  
parts (ancient and Muhammadan), and GRIGGS's *Preservation of Indian  
Monuments*, 100 plates. VINCENT SMITH, *The Jain Stūpa and other  
Antiquities of Mathurā* (Allahābād, 1901). E. W. SMITH, *Fathpur-Sikri*,  
four vols. quarto; and *Mughal Colour Decoration of Agra*, one vol. quarto.  
LE BON, *Les Monuments de l'Inde* (Paris, 1893). MAINDRON, *L'Art  
Indien* (Paris, 1898).



## CHAPTER IV

### NUMISMATICS

#### *I. The Ancient Coinage of Northern India*

FOR more than seventy years the varied coinages of India, which extend over a period of about 2,500 years, have been diligently studied by a multitude of collectors and scholars, whose labours have had a great share in the gradual recovery of the long-lost history of ancient India. For some obscure periods, indeed, our knowledge is derived almost exclusively from coins, the only contemporary documents now surviving. But, although much has been done, the numismatic field is so vast, and the difficulties of its thorough exploration are so great, that ample scope remains for further researches. In the following sketch an attempt is made, so far as the prescribed limits of space permit, to give a general view of the evolution of Indian coinage. The historical results of numismatic investigations are embodied in the chapter devoted to the early history of the country.

The introduction into India of the use of coins, that is to say, metallic pieces of definite weight authenticated as currency by marks recognized as a guarantee of value, may be ascribed with much probability to the seventh century B.C., when foreign maritime trade seems to have begun. There is reason to believe that the necessities of commerce with foreign merchants were the immediate occasion for the adoption by the Indian peoples of a metallic currency as well as of alphabetical writing.

Coinage, as Mr. James Kennedy justly observes, is, according to Oriental ideas, 'the business, not of the state, but of the banker and merchant'.<sup>1</sup> In accordance with this principle, the earliest Indian currency was struck by private persons, not by governments. This consists of bits of metal more or less rectangular in shape, and trimmed when necessary at the corners so as to scale the required weight. Sometimes the coins

<sup>1</sup> 'Early Commerce of Babylon with India,' *J. R. A. S.*, 1898, p. 281.



are altogether blank, more frequently they are blank on the reverse only, and, more frequently still, the reverse is impressed with one or two small marks, struck by a punch. The obverse commonly exhibits many such marks, impressed by separate punches at different times. This ancient coinage is therefore generally described by numismatists as 'punch-marked.' The Laws of Manu denote coins of this kind as *purāṇas*, or 'eldlings,' and Southern writers call them *salākās*, or 'dominoes.'

The metal is usually impure silver, containing about 20 per cent. of alloy. The silver was evidently prepared as a plate, which was then cut up into strips from which the bits were divided. Silver was never produced to any considerable extent in India, but has always been, as it still is, one of the chief items in the list of imports. Silver coins, consequently, cannot have come into use until silver was freely imported, and if that metal was not available before 700 B.C. no silver coins can be of earlier date. Mr. Kennedy's suggestion that the punch-marked coins were copied from Babylonian originals after the opening of maritime trade in the seventh century B.C. has much to recommend it, although it cannot be regarded as proved.

The most archaic-looking coins known are punch-marked copper pieces, found at extremely ancient sites near Benares. They are much more elongated in form than the silver pieces, and seem to have been cut from a bar and struck to a different scale of weights. These rare copper pieces are possibly older than any silver coin, and may be a memento of Babylonian trade by overland routes<sup>1</sup>.

The marks on the punch-marked coins, whether silver or copper, are extremely numerous and varied. They comprise rude outlines of men, animals, trees, the sun, and a variety of miscellaneous objects. Mr. Theobald has catalogued about 300 of these devices<sup>2</sup>. Legends are always absent. Punch-marked coins of roughly circular shape occasionally occur, and are probably a later development of the rectangular bits.

The silver coins, of which the best specimens weigh about 55 grains or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  grammes, are so adjusted in weight as to be the approximate equivalent of thirty-two *ratī* seeds (*Abrus precatorius*). The *ratī* may be rated as averaging about

<sup>1</sup> At Bairānt, a very ancient site in Benares District, Carlleyle found twenty of these copper pieces, but only four silver punch-marked coins (*Arch. S. Rep.*, xxii, 114). See also *J. A. S. B.*, 1897, pt. i, p. 298, pl. xxviii.

<sup>2</sup> *J. A. S. B.*, 1890, pt. i, pl. viii-xi.



1.80 grains The entire system of the ancient Hindū coinage of Northern India was based on the weight of the *ratī*. In the South other seeds served as a metric basis.

Cast coins, usually of copper or bronze, were largely used in Northern India along with the punch-marked currency. A few specimens are inscribed with characters dating from about 300 B.C. Sometimes the metal, while in a half-fused state, was struck with a small die, which produced a square or circular incuse hollow. Coins of this kind, which were frequently struck in the second century B.C., may be designated as 'hot-stamped.' An interesting series, belonging to the great city of Taxila in the Punjab, enables us to trace the development of regular double-die coins through the 'hot-stamped' and 'single-die' stages. The final adoption of the 'double-die' system was undoubtedly due to Greek and Roman example.

Alexander's victorious progress through the Punjab and Sind from March, 326, to September, 325 B.C., produced little direct effect on the Indian coinage. A chieftain in the Salt Range, named Sophytes (Saubhūti), issued a few silver pieces in Greek style, suggested probably by the well-known 'owls' of Athens; but, on the whole, the indigenous currency, like the other institutions of India, was unaffected by the great Macedonian's feat of arms. Immediately after his death (323 B.C.), the territories east of the Indus, which he had intended to annex permanently, were reconquered by the Indian Chandragupta, who became the first emperor of India, and administered his dominions on native principles. Not a trace remained of Alexander's governors, garrisons, or institutions.

In the middle of the third century B.C. the independent Bactrian kingdom was separated from the Seleucid empire of Syria, and in the following century several Bactrian monarchs, notably Eucratides and Menander, made incursions into India, where their coins are now found. Scions and connexions of the Bactrian royal family established themselves as rulers of principalities in the countries now known as Afghānistān, Baluchistān, and the Punjab, which became Hellenized to a considerable extent.

These princes issued an abundant currency, chiefly in silver and copper, modelled on Greek lines, and up to about 150 B.C. exhibiting a high degree of artistic merit. Some of the foreign kings on the border adopted the characteristic Indian square form for their coins, which in other respects also indicate the influence of Indian ideas. Bilingual legends were adopted to meet the convenience of a mixed population, and the devices



reproduced familiar Indian objects. The later Indo-Greek issues are semi-barbarous in style.

The Punjab excepted, India was little affected by the ideas of the West, and the vast populations of the interior continued their purchases and sales through the medium of the indigenous private currency. For this reason no coins are known bearing the name of Asoka (272-232 B.C.), or of any other member of the Maurya dynasty founded by his grandfather Chandra-gupta.

The working of Greek influence may perhaps be traced in the fact that the coins erroneously attributed by some authors to the Sunga dynasty (circa 188-76 B.C.) bear the names of kings, Agni-mitra and others. The coins of the later Andhrabhritya (or Āndhra) dynasty (circa A.D. 90-220), which are Northern in type although geographically belonging to the South, also frequently record the name of the reigning sovereign. But the old system of private coinage continued in many localities, and was still in full force in Central India at the time of the English conquest<sup>1</sup>. To this day the people of Bihār and Gorakhpur prefer the unauthorized 'dumpy pice' made at private mints in Nepāl to the lawful copper coinage of the British Government.

The conquest of the countries now known as Afghānistān and the Punjab by the chiefs of the Kushān clan of the Yueh-chi horde, about the middle and close of the first century A.D., brought India into relation with the Roman empire as extended eastward by Augustus and his successors. The prince, whom European scholars conveniently designate as Kadphises I (circa A.D. 45-85), annexed the Kābul valley and surrounding regions to the Kushān empire, and issued copper coins bearing on the obverse a king's head palpably imitated from that of Augustus, and on the reverse a figure of the king seated on a Roman curule chair.

His son, successor, and namesake, Kadphises II (circa A.D. 85-125), the conqueror of Northern India, carried much farther the imitation of the imperial Roman coinage, and struck a large number of gold pieces, both *aurei* and double *aurei*, exactly agreeing with their Roman prototypes in weight, though considerably inferior in purity.

The testimony of Pliny that in his time (A.D. 77) a copious stream of Roman gold flowed eastward is abundantly confirmed by the numerous hoards of Roman coins which have been discovered both in Northern and Southern India. In the

<sup>1</sup> Malcolm, *Central India*, ii, 84.



South, the imperial coins probably circulated at the ports as English sovereigns now circulate on the continent of Europe. In the North, large quantities of the Roman gold were probably melted down and reissued. The Kushān coins, although Roman *aurei* in weight, are mainly Oriental in style, and not merely slavish copies of Roman models. The constant reverse device on the pieces issued by Kadphises II is the figure of the Indian god Siva, attended by his sacred humped bull. The legends, which record the royal name and titles, are bilingual, in accordance with Bactrian practice. The obverse legend is inscribed in the Greek language and character, but the language of the reverse legend is a form of Prākṛit, or vernacular Sanskrit, and the character is a form of the Kharoshthī alphabet, read like Hebrew from right to left. Kadphises II also struck an extensive copper currency, similar in general style to his gold coinage. The copper coins, which commonly show signs of long use, are found in large quantities as far east as Benares.

The Indo-Roman coinage of the Kushān dynasty, commonly called Indo-Scythian, marks an epoch in the numismatic history of India. The Kushān kings, while retaining in their coin devices many features peculiarly Oriental, definitely abandoned the native Indian tradition and adopted in essentials the European form of coin. From this time forward the principal coinages of Northern India are double-die pieces, issued by the authority of the sovereign, and usually bearing either his effigy or his name, or both.

Kadphises II was succeeded (circa A.D. 125) by Kanishka, the conqueror of Kashmīr, renowned in Buddhist tradition as the convener of the last Church Council, and the zealous patron of the newer form of Buddhism<sup>1</sup>. This famous monarch regarded Kābul and Peshāwar as his capital cities, and issued, probably chiefly from those mints, vast quantities of gold and copper coin. His *aurei* agree with those of his predecessor in weight and purity, but differ widely in design and legend. The obverse device of the king standing sacrificing at a fire-altar was retained as inherited from Kadphises II. The novel reverse devices, which display astonishing variety, are devoted to the representation of an eclectic assemblage of gods and goddesses, beginning with the Greek Ἥλιος and Σελήνη, the Sun and Moon, and ending with Buddha, the Sākya sage. Many of the deities represented in

<sup>1</sup> The exact date of Kanishka is still undetermined, and Dr. Fleet believes that he preceded the Kadphises kings.



this strange company, such as Nanaia, Oesho, and others, are plainly Zoroastrian. Kanishka was apparently a fire-worshipper at first, and was converted to Buddhism in his later years. The legends on both sides of Kanishka's coins are in Greek characters only, and the title βασιλεὺς βασιλεων, 'king of kings,' although occasionally expressed in the Greek language, is usually translated into a tongue which may be described as a form of Old Persian. The abundant copper, or bronze, coinage of Kanishka resembles the gold.

The coinage, in both metals, of his successor Huvishka (acc. A.D. 153) is similar in general style. It agrees exactly in weight and purity with that of Kanishka, but is perhaps slightly inferior in execution. On the gold coins the king's bust is substituted for the standing figure; and on the bronze coins the monarch is depicted riding an elephant, or sitting cross-legged, or perched on the edge of a throne with one foot hanging down and the other tucked up. The reverses, like those of Kanishka's coins, exhibit an eclectic assemblage of deities, Greek, Persian, and Indian. The legends are in the Greek character.

With the accession of Huvishka's successor, Vāsudeva (circa A.D. 185), marked decadence sets in. The *aurei* retain their old weight, but each contains nearly ten grains less of pure gold. Vāsudeva reverted to the obverse device of the standing king sacrificing at an altar, as favoured by Kanishka, and to the reverse type of Siva with his bull, as used by Kadphises II. The eclectic pantheon of the two immediately preceding reigns has disappeared. The execution of Vāsudeva's coins is semi-barbarous, and his authentic issues are succeeded by a crowd of wholly barbarous imitations, many of which are copied from Sassanian models. The Hellenic tradition is maintained only by the use of corrupted Greek characters in the legends. The reign of Vāsudeva terminated about A.D. 225.

Nearly a century later (A.D. 320) a new imperial dynasty arose. The founder of the line assumed the name, Chandra Gupta, of the first Indian emperor, and fixed his capital at Pātaliputra, the ancient seat of empire. His son, Samudra Gupta, carried his victorious arms to the extremity of the Peninsula (circa A.D. 330), and the next emperor annexed Gujarāt and Kāthiāwār, to the shore of the Arabian Sea. In the reign of the fifth monarch the imperial power was shattered (circa A.D. 480) by the White Huns, whose fierce hordes had broken through the north-western passes, deluging the land with barbarism. India then reverted to her normal condition,



and again became a geographical expression for a seething mass of ill-defined and loosely organized petty states, engaged in unceasing internecine war, uncontrolled by any paramount authority.

The historical events thus briefly outlined are reflected in the coinage. Gupta gold coins, which Sir A. Cunningham considered to be the most interesting series in India, are in the main a continuation of the Kūshān coinage; and those struck during the time of the great emperors of the dynasty continued to be Indo-Roman *aurei* in weight, although, with one exception<sup>1</sup>, appreciably inferior in purity to the Kushān issues. The devices display a surprising variety on both the obverse and the reverse, and are in some cases more artistic than anything that had been seen in India since the days of the Bactrian monarchy.

Recent researches indicate that a marked revival of Sanskrit, as distinguished from the Prākṛit or vernacular, took place between A.D. 350 and 450 under the patronage of the Gupta emperors, who felt a personal interest in literary and artistic movements. The artistic merit of the best Gupta coins seems to be closely related to the literary revival which found its highest expression in the poems of Kālidāsa<sup>2</sup>. The favour in which classical Sanskrit was held in those days is clearly indicated by the coin-legends, which are expressed in neither Greek nor Prākṛit, but in formal Sanskrit written in accordance with the grammarians' rules. But the glory of this literary and artistic revival did not last long. The coinage shows signs of decadence early in the fifth century, and the final victory of the Huns about A.D. 480 swept away nearly all manifestations of intellectual and imaginative effort.

The rich variety of the earlier Gupta gold coin devices gradually settled down into one pattern, with the standing king for the obverse, and a goddess seated on a lotus flower for the reverse type. These two designs dominate the coinage of Northern India for centuries. The standing king is seen in a corrupt form on innumerable nameless coins, and may be traced in the provincial coinage of Kashmīr as late as 1339 (*C. M. I.*, p. 37). The seated goddess became the fashionable reverse device for the mediaeval Hindu dynasties, and even appears on coins struck at Kanauj by the Muhammadan king Muhammad bin Sām in 1194 (*Thomas*, p. 20).

<sup>1</sup> Prakāśāditya.

<sup>2</sup> See Bhandarkar's essay, *A Peep into the Early History of India* (Bombay, 1900).



The rare copper coins of the Gupta dynasty, though curious and not without interest, are devoid of artistic merit.

The Gupta silver coinage is imitated from that of the foreign Saka Satraps of Surāshtra or Kāthiāwār, whose dynasty, after enduring for three centuries, was overthrown by the third Gupta emperor about A.D. 390.

The Satrap coins are hemidrachmae, weighing from 30 to 36 grains. Their pedigree may be traced back to the Indo-Greek issues of Hyrcodes and Apollodotus Philopator. A vestige of the Hellenic tradition, kept alive by commerce with Alexandria, is preserved in corrupt Greek legends. The last trace of the use of the Greek alphabet in India had disappeared by A.D. 400; but the name drachma (*dramma*), as the designation of a coin, and the Greek weight-standard survived in certain regions at least until the eleventh or twelfth century.

After the fall of the Gupta empire the coinages of the countless native rulers and of the rude Hun invaders vie with each other in barbarous degradation. The partial restoration of the paramount power by Harshavardhana (A.D. 606) had no beneficial effect on the coinage. Certain moneys inscribed with the letter H, which have been ascribed to him, but without sufficient reason, could not be much worse executed<sup>1</sup>.

The prevalent style in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries was a barbarous imitation of the Sassanian coins of Persia, which are characterized by a representation of a fire-altar with supporters. This device, introduced into India by the Huns, was so corrupted by ignorant imitators as to be often unrecognizable by eyes not trained by study of the gradual degradation of the original type.

About the end of the ninth century several Hindu dynasties of note begin to emerge. These dynasties, the Chandels of Mahoba, the Tomars of Delhi, the Rāthors of Kanauj, and the Haihayas of Chedi or Central India, introduced a new style of coin, which was first struck by Gāngeyadeva of Chedi early in the eleventh century. In consequence, apparently, of Muhammadan example, the king's name and title in three lines occupied the obverse in lieu of his effigy, the reverse device being the seated goddess of the Gupta series. As has been already mentioned, coins of this pattern were struck by Muhammad bin Sām in 1194. The latest specimen is a Chandel coin issued about 1250.

Another new type was invented by the mint-masters of the Brāhman kings of Ohind, commonly, but erroneously, called

<sup>1</sup> Certain coins of this monarch, resembling the Gupta silver coinage, have been discovered recently by Mr. Burn (*J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 843).



'the Hindu kings of Kābul' (circa A.D. 860-950), which is known to numismatists as the 'Bull and Horseman,' because the device on the obverse is a horseman, and that on the reverse a bull. This type was copied by the Chauhān kings of Delhi and Ajmer, by the early Muhammadan Sultāns of Delhi up to the reign of Balban (1265; *C. C. N. I.*, p. 69), and by the Rājās of the petty sub-Himālayan State of Kāngra. In this little kingdom it survived until the beginning of the seventeenth century (*C. M. I.*, p. 108).

## II. Muhammadan and Indo-European

In the year A.D. 696-7 (A.H. 77), sixty-four years after the death of the Prophet, the first distinctive Muhammadan coins were struck by the Khalifa (Caliph) of Damascus. These pieces were strictly orthodox, being inscribed on both sides with pious phrases, and free from all taint of imagery. A few years later, in A.D. 712, Muhammad the son of Kāsim conquered Sind<sup>1</sup>, and the governors set up by him or his successors issued a considerable series of coins, chiefly silver, but including some copper, which have the distinction of being the first Muhammadan coins struck in India (*C. C. N. I.*, pp. 45, 55). They are modelled on the mintage of the Khalifas of Damascus and Baghdād, and are of some interest as giving information concerning the names of the governors and of the mint cities.

The first wave of Muslim conquest expended its force in the provinces of Sind and Multān in the Indus Valley, and made no impression on the vast mass of India. The native dynasties, Rāthors, Chandels, and the rest, went on coining rude money in their accustomed fashion, and neither knew nor cared anything about the numismatic innovations of the foreign zealots on the Indus.

The first serious Muslim attack on the interior Indian kingdoms was made towards the close of the tenth century by Sabuktagin, king of Ghazni, who defeated a formidable confederacy of princes, and established his authority at Peshāwar. His more famous son, Mahmūd of Ghazni, devoted the greater part of his reign of thirty-two years (A.D. 998-1030) to making plundering raids into India, and has thus some claim to be regarded as an Indian sovereign. He struck coins which are remarkable for possessing a marginal legend in Sanskrit, explanatory of the Arabic inscription (*Thomas*, p. 48). His son Masaud, and his grandson Maudūd, also struck coins

<sup>1</sup> The name is erroneously written Muhammad Kāsim by Elphinstone and many other writers.



at the same mint, copied from the 'Bull and Horseman' type of the kings of Ohind, and did not hesitate to violate the strict rule of the Korān by placing the images of creatures on their coins. So far as is known, these are the earliest Muhammadan coins struck in India which bear images (*C.C.N.I.*, p. 60). Notwithstanding its defiance of a fundamental rule of religion, the innovation maintained its ground, and the Muhammadan kings of Ghazni and North-western India continued to use the 'Bull and Horseman' device up to the time of Balban (A.D. 1265).

The real founder of the Musalmān dominion in India was Muizz-ud-din Muhammad bin Sām, otherwise known with embarrassing Oriental redundancy as Shahāb-ud-dīn, or Muhammad Ghori (A.D. 1193-1205). His Ghazni coins follow the old style of the Khalīfas of Baghdād; but his Indian coins, which are extremely numerous, usually exhibit the Ohind device of the 'Bull and Horseman,' and are mostly composed of billon, an alloy of copper and silver, mingled in irregular and widely varying proportions. This exceedingly inconvenient currency, the value of which could only be determined by assay or touch, was borrowed from the contemporary Hindu princes, and the prejudices of the conquered Indians were further humoured by the use of bilingual legends and the native scale of weights. Certain gold coins struck by Muhammad bin Sām in the Gangetic valley actually bear the image of the Hindu goddess Lakshmī. Images then disappear from the Muhammadan coinage of India, and are not again seen until the unorthodox Akbar and his son Jahāngīr ventured to reintroduce them on some limited issues.

Altamsh (Iltitmish), the most notable of the Turkish Slave kings of Delhi, who erected the Kutb Minār, kept his mint busy during his reign (A.D. 1210-35), and emitted a copious currency, chiefly in billon, comprising many varieties. His daughter Razīa (1236-9), the only queen who ever ruled at Delhi, perpetuated her name by the issue of a few rare coins. Balban (A.D. 1265-87), as has been mentioned, was the last sovereign of Delhi to use the 'Bull and Horseman' device. He struck a large number of silver coins of orthodox type, and a few gold pieces in the same style, besides small change in copper and billon.

The next notable reign from the numismatic point of view is that of Alā-ud-din Muḥammad Shāh (A.D. 1295-1315), the conqueror of the South. His silver, copper, and billon coins are extremely abundant, and his gold pieces are not very rare.



Some of his gold coins, inferior in purity to the standard coinage, seem to have been manufactured out of the treasure plundered from the Hindu kings of the South.

This able monarch's worthless son, Kutb-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh (A.D. 1316-20), introduced an innovation in the Muhammadan series by reverting to the old Hindu square form of coin, which continued to be used from time to time until the reign of Shāh Jahān.

Muhammad, son of Tughlak (1324-51 A.D.), one of the strangest figures in history, who was 'learned, merciless, religious, and mad,' has been called by Mr. Thomas the 'prince of moneyers.' The title was justly earned by the variety and beauty of his coins, which surpass those of all other Indian sovereigns in the elegance of their Arabic legends. This mad king tried to replenish his treasury by the simple expedient of coining brass in vast quantities and ordaining that it should be accepted as silver. In order to induce his subjects to accept this arrangement, the legends on the coins informed holders that 'truly he who obeys the Sultān, Muhammad bin Tughlak, obeys God,' and enjoined upon them the Korānic command to 'Obey God, and the Prophet, and those in authority.' But pious maxims affirming the divine right of kings, even when backed by the power of a cruel despot, failed to compel the acceptance of brass as silver; and a century after the tyrant's death, 'mountains' of the rejected coins piled up in his fort of Tughlakābād testified to the failure of his crude finance (*Thomas*, p. 247, note).

Muhammad bin Tughlak, having gained the throne by parricide, laid great stress upon the recognition of his title by the acknowledged head of the Musalmān world—the Khalifa of Egypt, who had succeeded to the honours formerly enjoyed by the rulers of Damascus and Baghdād. When this desired recognition was secured in about the middle of his reign, the Indian monarch discontinued the use of his own name on the coinage, and substituted that of the Egyptian Khalifa. Coins of this class are common.

The coinage of the succeeding kings of the Tughlak and Lodi dynasties offers little of interest. Ibrāhīm, the last Lodi king, was decisively defeated at Pānīpat in 1526 by Bābar, the founder of the dynasty of the 'Great Moguls.' The coins of Bābar followed foreign models.

Sher Shāh, the Afghān rival of Bābar's son Humāyūn, is entitled to the honour of establishing the reformed system of currency, which lasted throughout the Mughal period, was



maintained by the East India Company down to 1835, and is the basis of the existing British currency. He finally abolished the inconvenient billon coinage of mixed metal, and struck well-executed pieces in gold, silver, and copper, to a fixed standard of both weight and fineness. His silver rupees, which weigh 180 grains, and contain 175 grains of pure silver, being thus practically equal in value to the modern rupee, often have the king's name in Nāgari characters in addition to the usual Arabic inscriptions. The coins of the other kings of the struggling Sūri dynasty are similar, but much less numerous.

The early issues of the great Akbar (1555-1605), the contemporary of Queen Elizabeth, closely follow Sher Shāh's models, the gold and silver coins being broad pieces with elaborately interlaced Arabic legends. His later coins are smaller in diameter.

In the thirtieth year of his reign (A.D. 1584) Akbar utilized the coinage to express his attachment to the 'Divine Religion' which he had invented. His coins were henceforward dated in the years of the Divine Era beginning with February, 1556, the first year of the reign; and Persian names of the month were substituted for the customary Arabic. Many of the coins bear the ambiguous words *Allāhu Akbar*, which may be interpreted as meaning either 'God is most great,' or 'Akbar is God,' and were probably intended to convey a double sense to the select few who had been initiated into the mysteries of the imperial creed.

Akbar, like his son Jahāngir and his grandson Shāh Jahān, disregarded the Mosaic and Korānic prohibitions against making the likeness of anything that is in heaven or earth, and freely used the aid of pictorial art for the decoration of his palaces; but on the coinage he employed image devices very sparingly, and only on three very rare types in gold. The square coins of Akbar in gold and silver, which bear on the corners the names of 'the four companions' of Muhammad, being much prized as amulets, are frequently imitated. The long list of his mints, at least seventy in number, testifies to the extent of his empire.

Jahāngir maintained on the whole his father's mint system, but rarely struck copper coins, which had been abundantly provided by the copious issues of Sher Shāh and Akbar. He abandoned the use of Akbar's 'Divine Year,' and expressed the date according to the ordinary Muhammadan epoch, although still continuing to employ the Persian solar year and



months for the record of the regnal years. He habitually inserted in the legends of his coins doggerel Persian couplets, which had been tentatively employed by Akbar, and was followed in this practice by many of his successors.

The issues of Jahāngīr are remarkable for their beauty and also for the introduction of a number of curiosities—the delight of the collector. His deep and abiding affection for his able consort Nūr Jahān is commemorated by the pieces struck in his later years, which bear her name in conjunction with his own. His contempt for the prohibitions of orthodoxy and his love of the bottle are recorded by the gold coins which represent the monarch sitting cross-legged on his throne, goblet in hand. Other portrait coins depict him with different accessories. He was the only Muhammadan ruler of India who ventured to place his portrait on his coins.

The much-prized zodiacal series in gold and silver was the result of a freak, which is thus described in his autobiography:—

‘Formerly,’ he writes, ‘it was customary to strike my name on one side of the coin, and that of the place, and the month, and the year of the reign, on the obverse. It now occurred to my mind that, instead of the name of the month, the figure of the sign of the zodiac corresponding to the particular month should be stamped. For instance, in the month of Farwardīn, the figure of a ram; in Ardibihisht that of a bull, and so on; that is, in every month in which a coin might be struck, the figure of the constellation in which the sun might be at the time should be impressed on one side of it. This was my own invention: it had never been done before.’

Nor was it ever done again. The most nearly complete genuine series of these curiosities, which have been extensively forged, is that in the British Museum.

The next emperor, Shāh Jahān (A.D. 1627–58), abstained from his father’s numismatic eccentricities, and issued an abundant coinage in silver and gold. Some of the gold pieces are of enormous size. His copper coins are rare. A small issue of square coins in white base metal, bearing his name, struck at Sopāra near Bombay, were probably intended to supersede similar Portuguese coins current in that part of the country<sup>1</sup>.

The coinage of the fanatical Aurangzeb (1659–1707) is, of course, strictly orthodox. Motives of reverence induced him to abstain from placing the *Kalima*, or Muhammadan confession of faith, on objects which must necessarily be handled

<sup>1</sup> *Sopāra and Padana*, Bombay Educ. Soc. Press, p. 7, pl. ii, 9; reprinted from *J. Bom. R. A. S.*, 1882.



alike by the unbelievers and the faithful. His coinage is monotonous in character, and chiefly interesting for the mints, seventy or more in number, of which it records the names.

The numismatic history of the feeble successors of Aurangzeb need not be recounted in detail. It is remarkable for the fact that, notwithstanding the disintegration and disorder of the empire, the weight and fineness of the imperial coinage continued to be maintained. By gradual steps it passed into an Anglo-Indian coinage. The East India Company, which had for a long time surreptitiously copied the imperial issues, obtained in January, 1717, a formal grant of the right to coin at Bombay. Permission to copy the rupees of Arcot, near Madras, was granted in 1742, and in 1757 the Company's mint at Calcutta was legally established. Additional mints were subsequently set up in the interior at Benares, Farrukhābād, and other places. All the coins struck at these mints were copies of various Mughal issues, distinguished only by the insertion of emblems, such as the cinquefoil and lion.

Ultimately the necessity for an authoritative currency became pressing, and the temporary expedient was adopted of selecting for mechanical imitation the Mughal coins of certain mints and years. For example, the Calcutta mint, from the year 1793, struck copies of the rupees issued in the name of the titular emperor Shāh Ālam at Murshidābād in the nineteenth year of his reign, which became known as *sikka* rupees; while the Farrukhābād mint copied the rupees of the forty-fifth year of the same monarch.

This unsatisfactory system was swept away by the legislation of 1835-6, when 'the Company established an English coinage with the head of William IV in place of the name of the Mughal emperor, and all the older issues were ordered to be suppressed.' The standard rupee thus established weighs 180 grains, or one *tola*, and contains 175 grains of pure silver. It is reckoned as equivalent to 16 annas, and the anna is subdivided into 12 pies. The legal tender is silver; but recent legislation, by restricting the volume of the coinage, has given the rupee an artificial value, and made it equivalent to the fifteenth part of a sovereign, which may now be tendered in payment of debts at the rate of 15 rupees. From 1835 the evolution of Indian coinage may be considered as closed; the currency of India from that date is a branch of that of the British empire.

The coinages of the independent Muhammadan States—Bengal, Mālwa, Jaunpur, Gujarāt, and others—which from time



to time came into being as the imperial power of Delhi was obscured, do not call for detailed notice. They are closely related to the imperial series. The octagonal silver coinage of the Hinduized Ahom dynasty in Assam is peculiar and well executed.

The coinages of the modern Native States, which were formed for the most part during the decay of the Mughal empire in the eighteenth century, are, almost without exception, crude in design, coarse in execution, and wanting in interest. In recent years many of the States have agreed to use the imperial coinage.

The Indo-European currencies, of which a good summary account will be found in Captain Tufnell's *Hints*, may likewise be dismissed here with only a passing notice. The complicated history of the East India Company's coinage may be pursued by the curious reader in Mr. Thurston's works. The Indo-Portuguese coins, struck at seven mints, of which Goa was the principal, have been described by the same painstaking author. The Indo-Danish mint at Tranquebar produced a considerable variety of coins, many of which are now either very rare or no longer extant. The lead coins (A.D. 1640-87) are among the rarest. Coins of the same metal were also issued by the English and Dutch factories. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Dutch had mints at Pulicat, Tuticorin, and several other places in Southern India, where they struck coins in gold, silver, and copper. The Indo-French coinage minted at Pondicherry is small in volume and poor in variety. Its characteristic devices are the cock and the fleur-de-lis.

### III. Southern India

The term Southern India is to be understood as a general name for the Peninsula to the south of the Nerbada river and the Vindhyan mountains, the home of the Dravidian races. This vast region, except in prehistoric times, was far less affected by foreign influence than were the plains of the North. The isolation of the South is reflected in its coinage, which was developed by the Dravidians on independent lines, and presents a general aspect differing widely from that of the North. But the isolation of the Peninsula was not absolute; and some classes of coins which, from a geographical point of view, must be included in the southern division, are, in respect of their type, to be regarded as outliers of the northern system, which followed foreign models.



The coinage of Southern India presents greater difficulties to the student and offers less reward for his labours than that of the North. The political history of the Dravidian countries is obscure, examples of really ancient coins are rare, and the comparatively modern issues which fill collectors' cabinets are ill adapted to serve as aids to the historian striving to recover the outlines of the story of a long-forgotten past. The coins are frequently extremely minute, sometimes weighing less than 2 grains; the devices are crude and indistinct; legends are commonly either absent, or too brief and enigmatical to be of use; and dates, except on certain late Muhammadan coins, are invariably lacking.

The extraordinary scarcity of really ancient southern coins may be partially explained by the destructive raids of plundering invaders from the North, who swept the country bare, and brought home untold treasure. The earliest recorded raid of this kind is that of Samudra Gupta, about A.D. 330, who penetrated nearly to the extremity of the Peninsula, and enriched his treasury with vast spoil. Nearly a thousand years later his exploit was repeated by Malik Kāfūr, who carried off to Delhi gold valued at about £3,000,000 sterling. The later Muhammadan invaders were not slow to imitate the example of their forerunners; and in 1565 the sack of Vijayanagar, one of the most magnificent cities of the world, scattered or destroyed the hoarded wealth of many generations.

The domino-shaped punch-marked coinage, the *purānas* or 'eldlings' of the law-books, as described at the beginning of this chapter, was common to both Northern and Southern India. The ancient cast coins which circulated along with the punch-marked coins in the North do not seem to occur in the South. The date when the silver and copper punch-marked coins ceased to be current is not known, but it is probably to be placed not earlier than A.D. 200. In Coimbatore silver punch-marked coins have been found associated with denarii of Augustus, who died in A.D. 14; and similar pieces have been obtained from a megalithic tomb, which may be as late in date. In the Pāndyan kingdom of the extreme south the 'punch-marked' coins pass into very similar die-struck coins in copper, and Mr. Loventhal suggests with considerable probability that the use of the die was introduced from the North along with Buddhism. But, taking Southern India as a whole, the punch-marked currency may be said to have had no progeny. Die-struck silver coins of at all ancient date are very few and unimportant. In historical times the principal coinage of the



South was in gold not silver. At the time of Malik Kāfur's raid (A. D. 1310) it is recorded that the southern treasure consisted exclusively of gold.

When or how this gold coinage originated is not known. The modern miners in the Wynaad and Kolār districts find everywhere the traces of ancient workings, and the conjecture seems probable that the discovery of the gold-mines was the immediate cause of the substitution of gold for silver in the main currency. The earliest known gold coins, which Dr. Bidie believed to date from the first two centuries of the Christian era, are slightly flattened pellets or globules of metal, bearing no device save a minute and indistinct punch mark. These curious pieces, which are extremely rare, weigh about 52 grains (3.368 grammes) each.

The southern system of coinage, like the northern, is based on the weights of indigenous seeds. The northern scale rested on the *ratī* seed (*Abrus precatorius*), which may conveniently be taken as equivalent to about 1.80 grains. According to this system the *purāna*, or silver punch-marked coin, was equal in weight to thirty-two *ratī* seeds. The southerners used as the basis of their scale the *kalanju* seed, or 'Molucca bean' (*Guilandina* or *Caesalpinia Bonduc*), weighing about 50 grains, and the *manjādi* seed (*Adenanthera pavonina*), weighing about a tenth of the *kalanju*. According to this scale, the *purāna* was roughly equal in weight to a *kalanju* seed. The standard coins, subsequently known as *pon*, *hon*, *varāha*, or 'pagoda,' usually weighed approximately 52 grains, and the small coins, the *fanams* of later times, were each a tenth of the 'pagoda' of 52 grains. This system lasted substantially unchanged up to 1833. In comparatively modern times Dutch ducats and Venetian sequins also circulated as roughly equivalent in weight to the pagoda or golden *kalanju*. Some of the more ancient gold coins are considerably heavier, ranging up to 70 grains, and it is not clear how their weight was calculated.

Among the more ancient issues, the most intelligible and interesting series is that attributable to the Chālukya dynasty, which separated into two branches—the Western, first at Vātāpi (Bādāmi), subsequently at Kalyān; and the Eastern, first at Vengi, subsequently at Rājahmundry, about A.D. 620. The coins of this series are so rare that all the specimens which Sir Walter Elliot could collect in the course of twenty-five years' search suffice only to fill one small plate<sup>1</sup>. The board device characteristic of the Chālukya coinage is the origin of the

<sup>1</sup> *Madras J. Lit. and Sc.*, 1858, pl. i.



vernacular designation *varāha* or *varāgan* ('boar') universally applied to the peculiar gold coin of Southern India, to which the European settlers subsequently gave the name 'pagoda,' supposed to be a corruption of the word '*bhagavati*,' or 'goddess.'

Some of the earliest Chālukya pieces, dating perhaps from the sixth century, are cup-shaped, with plain reverse. The obverse is the concave side, the central figure being a boar, around which four or five other symbols have been subsequently stamped by means of smaller dies or punches. These curious coins thus exhibit a transition from the use of punches to that of a regular die. Apparently the practice of punch-marking lingered on the gold coinage long after its disuse on the silver and copper.

A few specimens of the later Chālukya issues, assigned vaguely to the period between A.D. 600 and 1000, approach the dumpy form of the modern pagoda, but are heavier in weight than the heaviest of the recent pagodas. The Chālukya boar, as well as the fish emblem of the Pāndya dynasty of the extreme south, continues to appear on Chola coins of the eleventh century, by which period the Chola dynasty of Tanjore had absorbed the Chālukya and Pāndya kingdoms.

Many of the Chola coins exhibit on the obverse an exceedingly crude standing figure, borrowed from the Pāndyas, who in their turn had imitated it from the familiar 'standing king' type of the Gupta kings of Northern India. The famous monarch Rājārājā (acc. A.D. 985) was the first Chola king to adopt this device, which was again imitated on the abundant coinage of the Ceylonese Napoleon, Parākrama Bāhu (acc. A.D. 1153). Another example of the intrusion of a northern type of coinage into the South is afforded, as already noticed, by the much more ancient Andhrabhṛitya, or Āndhra, coins (circa A.D. 90-220).

The coins of the powerful dynasty of Vijayanagar (circa A.D. 1340-1565), beginning with those of Bukka, the first king, constitute a long series, chiefly in gold. The coins agree in general aspect with the modern dumpy pagoda, and weigh, approximately, either 52 grains or half that amount<sup>1</sup>. After the destruction of Vijayanagar, in A.D. 1565, this series was extensively imitated by innumerable native chieftains, as well as by the European factories.

<sup>1</sup> Additional references for the Vijayanagar series are: HULTZSCH, *I. A.* xx, p. 301, 2 pl.; *ibid.*, xxi, p. 321, 2 pl.; *ibid.*, xxv, p. 317, 2-pl. RANGA CHARI and DESIKA CHARI, *ibid.*, xxiii, p. 24, 1 pl.



The coinage of Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan, as well as that of Krishna Rāja of Mysore, is also based on the Vijayanagar model. The imperial currency is now used in the Mysore State, but the Travancore mint still issues coinage in the southern style. Tipu's coinage is of special interest, owing to the fanciful changes introduced by him, including a new set of names for the mint towns, a special era dating from the birth of the Prophet, and a whimsical method of expressing the dates. The numismatist is thankful to find the dates given in any fashion.

The coins of the Bahmani and other Muhammadan States of the South are executed in substantially the same style as the ordinary Delhi coinage, and have no connexion with the peculiar southern system.

During the eighteenth century the currency of the Peninsula fell into a state of such utter confusion that in 1806 the English officials administering the Ceded Districts of Cuddapah and Bellary found thirty-two kinds of gold pagodas and fifteen kinds of silver rupees in circulation. Legislation passed in 1833 swept away this chaos, and made the rupees of Madras, Bombay, and Upper India equal in value and equivalent to fifteen-sixteenths of the *sikka* rupee of Murshidabad, which still continued current in Lower Bengal, Bihār, and Orissa. Acts of the Legislature, passed in 1835 and subsequent years, established the modern Anglo-Indian currency system throughout India.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

## PRINCIPAL REFERENCES

- General.** MARSDEN, *Numismata Orientalia* (1825). WILSON, *Ariana Antiqua* (1841). PRINSEP, *Essays*, ed. THOMAS (1858). THOMAS, 'Ancient Indian Weights' (*Intern. Num. Or.*). CUNNINGHAM, *Coins of Ancient India*, 1891 (*C. A. I.*); *Coins of Mediaeval India*, 1894 (*C. M. I.*). RODGERS, *Coin-Collecting in Northern India* (Allahabad, 1894) (*C. C. N. I.*); *Catalogue of Coins in Indian Museum*; *Catalogue of Coins in Lahore Museum*. RAPSON, *Indian Coins* (1898). V. A. SMITH, *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, including the cabinet of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. i (Oxford, 1906).
- Bactrian, Indo-Parthian, Indo-Scythian, or Kushān.** VON SALLE, *Die Nachfolger Alexanders des Grossen in Baktrien und Indien* (1883). GARDNER, *Greek and Scythic Coins of Bactria and India* (1886) (*B. M. Cat.*). CUNNINGHAM, 'Coins of the Indo-Scythians' (*Num. Chron.*, 1888-92, republ. 1892); 'Coins of the Later Indo-Scythians' (*ibid.*, 1893-4, republ. 1894).



**Gupta Period.** V. A. SMITH, 'Gupta Gold Coins,' (*J. A. S. B.*, 1884, pt. i); 'Coinage of the Gupta Dynasty' (*J. R. A. S.*, 1889; *ibid.*, 1893; *J. A. S. B.*, 1894, pt. i). RAPSON and INDRAJI, 'The Western Kshatrapas' (*J. R. A. S.*, 1890 and 1899).

**Muhammadian.** THOMAS, *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, and Supplement* (1871). RODGERS, 'Six Supplements' to above (*J. A. S. B.*, pt. i, 1880, 1883, 1886, 1894, 1896). LANE-POOLE, *Coins of the Sultans of Delhi; Coins of the Muhammadian States of India; Coins of the Moghul Emperors of Hindustan* (*B. M. Catalogues*, 1884-92). The Historical Introduction to the last-named work was separately reprinted (Constable, 1892). H. NELSON WRIGHT, *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*; vol. ii, *Muhammadian Coins* (Oxford, 1907). DR. CODRINGTON's *Manual of Musulman Numismatics* (1904) is of considerable value. KING, L. W., 'History and Coinage of Malwa' (*Num. Chron.*, 1904); BURN, R., and other writers on Mughal mints and various topics in the Numismatic Supplement to *J. A. S. B.*, 1904.

**Modern Native States.** WEBB, *Currencies of the Hindu States of Rājputāna* (1893). TEMPLE, 'Coins of the Modern Native Chiefs of the Panjāb' (*J. A.*, 1889); 'Currency and Coinage among the Burmese' (*ibid.*, 1897-8). RODGERS, 'The Coins of the Sikhs' (*J. A. S. B.*, pt. i, 1881). HOERNLE, 'Notes on Coins of Native States' (*ibid.*, pt. i, 1897).

**Indo-European.** THURSTON, 'History of the Coinage of the E. I. Company'; 'Portuguese Coins' (*Cat. Madras Museum*); 'Note on the History of the E. I. Company's Coinage' (*J. A. S. B.*, pt. i, 1893). REA, 'Dutch Coinage' (in *Monumental Remains of the Dutch E. I. Company*, vol. xxv *Arch. S. Rep. New Imp. S.*). HULTZSCH, 'Indo-Danish Coins' (*J. A.*, 1893). RANGA CHARI and DESIKA CHARI, 'Danish Coins from Tranquebar' (*ibid.*, 1893, 1895; *Mad. J. Lit. and Sc.*, 1888-9). DA CUNHA, 'Contributions to the Study of Indo-Portuguese Numismatics' (*J. Bom. B. R. A. S.*, vols. xiv, xv).

**Southern India.** ELLIOT, *Coins of Southern India* (1877) (*C. S. I.*). RHYS DAVIDS, 'Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon' (1877) (*Int. Num. Or.*); largely corrected by LOWSLEY, 'Coins and Tokens of Ceylon' (*Num. Chron.*, 1895). LOVENTHAL, *The Coins of Tinnevely* (Madras, 1888). BIDIE, 'The Pagoda or Varāha Coins of Southern India' (*J. A. S. B.*, pt. i, 1883; republ. by Higginbotham, Madras). THURSTON, 'Coins of Mysore'; 'Coins of Ceylon' (*Mad. Museum Cat.*). TUFNELL, 'Hints to Coin-Collectors in Southern India' (Madras, 1888). HAWKES, *Coinage of Mysore* (1856).



## CHAPTER V

### INDIAN ARCHITECTURE

To present, even in the merest outline, any satisfactory account of Indian architecture in the space allotted in the following pages may seem almost impossible. In no other country, perhaps, have so many various styles been employed, nor have developments and changes of the styles been so marked. To separate these various forms into well-defined groups with distinctly recognized characteristics, and to trace their modifications in the course of history, is the task presented to the student. To give any comprehensive outline of the development of these varieties and of their complex relations to one another would necessitate entering into details and the employment of illustrations that would be incompatible with the extent and aims of this chapter: the most that can be attempted is a sketch of the main features of architectural advancement with reference to outstanding examples, to which may be added some notices of less-known groups. For a fuller account the reader may be referred to Fergusson's *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*.

The careful study of this art as developed in India is of extreme interest for the general history of architecture; and, whatever may be his estimate of its aesthetic qualities, the student cannot fail to realize that the designers of Indian structures attained as successfully as their Western contemporaries the aims they had before them, though they used arrangements and adopted forms and details very different from those of Occidental builders in ancient or mediaeval times. These forms and their adaptations of course require study for their proper appreciation; but once this is understood they become really interesting—for the perception of the suitability of the design to its purpose creates an interest, if not an admiration, for the whole. But besides the scientific advantages of the study, which need not be here enumerated, it has been remarked by the late Mr. Fergusson—to whose genius the science of the history of architecture owes so much—that 'it will undoubtedly be conceded by those who



are familiar with the subject that, for certain qualities, the Indian buildings are unrivalled. They display an exuberance of fancy, a lavishness of labour, and an elaboration of detail to be found nowhere else.'

Without any properly historical chronicle, our knowledge of Indian history and antiquities is hampered by difficulties not perhaps found in the case of any other country. We possess scarcely a landmark in history previous to the invasion of India by Alexander the Great in the fourth century B.C., nor do we know of an architectural monument of earlier date. For later periods there are fortunately a few examples dated by inscriptions, and for others—by applying the scientific principles developed by Thomas Rickman for the discrimination of other styles and relative ages of architectural works—we are now enabled to arrange the monuments of India with considerable certainty in chronological sequence or order of succession.

Architecture, it must be understood, is something more than the mere art of building in any form; and, if a definition is required, it must be that it is the fine art of designing and constructing ornamental buildings in wood, stone, or other material. It is thus distinct from common building or civil engineering.

### *Early Architecture—Wooden*

It is generally conceded that in the early architecture of India, as in that of Burma, China, and Japan, wood was solely or chiefly employed; and, if brick or stone were in use, it was only as a building material for foundations and for engineering purposes. Even as late as the end of the fourth century B.C. we find Megasthenes stating that Pātaliputra, the capital of Chandragupta, was 'surrounded by a wooden wall pierced with loopholes for the discharge of arrows'; and if the capital were defended by such palisading, we may fairly infer that the architecture of the time was wholly wooden. And, for all religious or private structures in a tropical climate, wood has marked advantages over stone. On the Sānchī gateways, brick walls are represented, apparently, however, as fences or limits with serrated copings, but not in architectural structures. And at whatever date stone came to be introduced, the Hindus continued and repeated the forms they had employed in the earlier material, and preserved their own style, so that it bore witness to the antecedent general use of wood. Hence we are able to trace its conversion into lithic forms until finally its origin disappears in its absorption in later styles.



The perishable nature of this material readily accounts for the disappearance of all Indian buildings of early date. Memorial *stūpas*, it is true, have been assigned by some archaeologists to a date previous to the fourth century B.C.; but they have been excavated with so little conception of scientific method that the main result has been the destruction of such evidences of their real age as might have existed. We have thus no monument of an architectural character that we can cite as certainly belonging to a date before the third century B.C.: one to be noted presently is hardly architectural and shows but little experience in the use of stone. The transition from wood to stone was naturally, as in other countries, made gradually, and at first by the use of brick, to fill in the wooden framing of the structures.

The spread of Buddhism to the westward and, at latest, the invasion of Alexander brought India into contact with Persia, where, in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., Cyrus and the succeeding Achaemenian kings had hewn out mausoleums in the rocks and constructed palaces with stone basements, pillars, and doorways, filling in the walls with brick, as in the earlier Assyrian buildings. These works would naturally attract the attention of Indian visitors—whether missionaries, ambassadors, or merchants; and the report of such magnificent structures would tempt Indian princes to copy them. The embassies of Megasthenes to Chandragupta, and of Deimachus to his son, were probably not the only visits of the kind during the interval between the time of Alexander and the accession of Asoka; and such visitors from the West were specially suited to convey a knowledge of Persian arts to the contemporary Indian potentates. The daughter of Seleucus Nikator, too, who was given in marriage to Chandragupta, may have helped in this.

By the middle of the third century B.C. we find the great Asoka in communication with the contemporary kings of Syria, Egypt, Macedonia, Epirus, and Cyrene; and to his reign belong the great stone pillars, with capitals of Persian type, that are engraved with his religious edicts. A convert to Buddhism, Asoka is credited with the construction, all over the country, of vast numbers of *stūpas*—monumental structures enshrining relics of Sākyamuni Buddha or other Buddhist saints; and with them were erected monasteries and chapels for the monks. We cannot positively identify any of the few still existing *stūpas* as having been actually built by him; but there can scarcely be a doubt that the sculptured rails at Buddh



are familiar with the subject that, for certain qualities, the Indian buildings are unrivalled. They display an exuberance of fancy, a lavishness of labour, and an elaboration of detail to be found nowhere else.'

Without any properly historical chronicle, our knowledge of Indian history and antiquities is hampered by difficulties not perhaps found in the case of any other country. We possess scarcely a landmark in history previous to the invasion of India by Alexander the Great in the fourth century B.C., nor do we know of an architectural monument of earlier date. For later periods there are fortunately a few examples dated by inscriptions, and for others—by applying the scientific principles developed by Thomas Rickman for the discrimination of other styles and relative ages of architectural works—we are now enabled to arrange the monuments of India with considerable certainty in chronological sequence or order of succession.

Architecture, it must be understood, is something more than the mere art of building in any form; and, if a definition is required, it must be that it is the fine art of designing and constructing ornamental buildings in wood, stone, or other material. It is thus distinct from common building or civil engineering.

### *Early Architecture—Wooden*

It is generally conceded that in the early architecture of India, as in that of Burma, China, and Japan, wood was solely or chiefly employed; and, if brick or stone were in use, it was only as a building material for foundations and for engineering purposes. Even as late as the end of the fourth century B.C. we find Megasthenes stating that Pātaliputra, the capital of Chandragupta, was 'surrounded by a wooden wall pierced with loopholes for the discharge of arrows'; and if the capital were defended by such palisading, we may fairly infer that the architecture of the time was wholly wooden. And, for all religious or private structures in a tropical climate, wood has marked advantages over stone. On the Sānchī gateways, brick walls are represented, apparently, however, as fences or limits with serrated copings, but not in architectural structures. And at whatever date stone came to be introduced, the Hindus continued and repeated the forms they had employed in the earlier material, and preserved their own style, so that it bore witness to the antecedent general use of wood. Hence we are able to trace its conversion into lithic forms until finally its origin disappears in its absorption in later styles.



The perishable nature of this material readily accounts for the disappearance of all Indian buildings of early date. Memorial *stūpas*, it is true, have been assigned by some archaeologists to a date previous to the fourth century B.C.; but they have been excavated with so little conception of scientific method that the main result has been the destruction of such evidences of their real age as might have existed. We have thus no monument of an architectural character that we can cite as certainly belonging to a date before the third century B.C.: one to be noted presently is hardly architectural and shows but little experience in the use of stone. The transition from wood to stone was naturally, as in other countries, made gradually, and at first by the use of brick, to fill in the wooden framing of the structures.

The spread of Buddhism to the westward and, at latest, the invasion of Alexander brought India into contact with Persia, where, in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., Cyrus and the succeeding Achaemenian kings had hewn out mausoleums in the rocks and constructed palaces with stone basements, pillars, and doorways, filling in the walls with brick, as in the earlier Assyrian buildings. These works would naturally attract the attention of Indian visitors—whether missionaries, ambassadors, or merchants; and the report of such magnificent structures would tempt Indian princes to copy them. The embassies of Megasthenes to Chandragupta, and of Deimachus to his son, were probably not the only visits of the kind during the interval between the time of Alexander and the accession of Asoka; and such visitors from the West were specially suited to convey a knowledge of Persian arts to the contemporary Indian potentates. The daughter of Seleucus Nikator, too, who was given in marriage to Chandragupta, may have helped in this.

By the middle of the third century B.C. we find the great Asoka in communication with the contemporary kings of Syria, Egypt, Macedonia, Epirus, and Cyrene; and to his reign belong the great stone pillars, with capitals of Persian type, that are engraved with his religious edicts. A convert to Buddhism, Asoka is credited with the construction, all over the country, of vast numbers of *stūpas*—monumental structures enshrining relics of Sākyamuni Buddha or other Buddhist saints; and with them were erected monasteries and chapels for the monks. We cannot positively identify any of the few still existing *stūpas* as having been actually built by him; but there can scarcely be a doubt that the sculptured rails at Buddh



Gayā and Bharhut, the caves at Barābar, and the oldest of the cave monasteries in Western India, were excavated during the existence of the Maurya dynasty, or at least within the two centuries following Asoka's accession.

It was thus partly, at least, to Buddhism, under the impulse of this powerful sovereign, that we owe the inception of all the monuments that have come down to us from that age. Buddhism had not then developed the cult of a personal Buddha farther than to reverence his relics, the representation of his footmarks, the sacred *bodhi* tree and other symbols, combined perhaps with aboriginal snake-worship. But we must keep in mind that the Jains and other sects, contemporary with the Buddhists, were also protected by this beneficent monarch, and that they raised shrines and constructed cave temples and monastic abodes for their devotees, and further, that these are now recognized by distinctive symbols, by inscriptions, or other evidences of the sects for whom they were prepared.

### *Stone Architecture—Stūpas*

One structural building, close to Rājagriha or Buddh Gayā, is claimed as probably of earlier date than the age of Asoka. This is the great basement known as Jarāsandha-kī baithak. It is about 85 ft. square at the base, and slopes upwards from 20 to 28 ft. to a platform 74 ft. by 78 ft., built entirely of large unhewn stones, neatly fitted together without mortar, and contains fifteen small cells, mostly on the north side, each 6 or 7 ft. in length, and half that width. This is apparently the 'stone house' mentioned by Hsuen Tsiang, and the rude cavern behind it would correspond to the traditional Asura's dwelling. So far, then, as we at present know, this structure may represent the earliest *vihāra* or monastic dwelling found in India, and its resemblance to the Birs Nimrud has been pointed out by Mr. Fergusson.

On the inscribed pillars or *lāts* set up by Asoka, besides the Persian form of capital, we find the honeysuckle with the bead and reel and the cable ornaments employed in earlier Assyrian and Persian sculpture; and, though not noticed afterwards in India proper, these continued in use in Gandhāra on the north-west frontier for about four centuries, which seems to indicate that it was from Persia that these forms first came, along with the suggestion that led to the conversion in India of wooden architecture into stone. Many of these *lāts*, as they



are called, have been destroyed ; but it seems probable that they stood originally beside *stūpas* or other sacred structures. Beside the great *stūpa* at Sānchī-Kānākhedā, near Bhilsa, there was found a portion of one of Asoka's pillars, with a fragment of one of his edicts upon it ; but in all other cases the buildings have now disappeared.

The *stūpas* were more or less conventional or architectural representations of funeral tumuli, and were constructed for the relics of the Buddha and of his disciples. How this relic-worship originated and came to hold so large a place in the Buddhist cult we can hardly conjecture ; the sentiment could not have arisen for the first time on the death of Gautama, when, we are told, eight *stūpas* were built over the corporeal relics, a ninth over the vessel (*drona*) by which they were divided, and a tenth over the charcoal of the funeral pile--the erection of such monuments must have been an established custom long before. Asoka, we are told, pulled down the first *stūpas* over Buddha's remains, and erected others, which were doubtless different and more architectural. But whether or not we shall yet discover, from actual examination, their real construction, we can hardly doubt that they formed the general model for such objects for the following centuries, and their outward appearance is often represented on later monuments.

The Sānchī-Kānākhedā *stūpas*, of which two or three were quite entire at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the second largest of which almost certainly dates from about 200 B.C., may be accepted as examples of the Asoka pattern. On a low circular drum, a hemispherical dome was constructed, with a procession path round the latter, and over the dome a box-like structure surmounted by an umbrella and surrounded by a stone railing. Round the drum was an open passage for circumambulation, and the whole was enclosed by a massive rail with gates on four sides. The dome, surrounded by its drum or berm, was in no sense architectural, and, having but one special purpose, could convey no information as to the art of the age. The railings, however, are most interesting : they are constructed as closely as possible after wooden patterns, and are the only examples of this type that survive here or elsewhere. On the second *stūpa*, which has been badly ruined by bungling excavators, the sculptures are chiefly on discs upon the uprights of the rails ; and from the difference of character, as compared with those of the *toranas* of the first and third *stūpas*, they seem to indicate an earlier stage. But these have not secured the attention they deserve, nor have they been



adequately depicted. The uprights are square, and there are as usual three rails between each, and a heavy coping or head-rail is placed over the uprights and holds them together by tenons on their upper ends.

To about the same age must belong the remains of the rail round the Buddh Gayā temple, and probably only a little later comes the Bharhut *stūpa* enclosure. The remains of a rail found at Muttra is of early Jain work, and may perhaps be placed slightly later than the last. The uprights are carved with full-length basso-relievo figures or with discs; but the remains found there belong to a lengthened period, and the want of information as to the relative positions in which the various subjects were found deprives us of the basis of any safe induction as to the development of the art.

In the great *stūpa* at Sānchī we have something more complete: the uprights are still square, and the three cross-bars between each pair are lenticular in section; but, like the *stūpa* itself, they are of unusually large dimensions, the rail being 11 ft. in height. This, as well as the smaller rails that were formerly on the berm and round the platform over the dome, were all carved after wooden patterns. But here the erections of lofty *toranas* at the entrances formed a better field for sculpture than the rail, and it was to them that it was exclusively applied.

These ornamental gateways must have belonged to most if not to all of the larger and more notable *stūpas*; though at first they were evidently of wood, and the earliest Buddhist missionaries seem to have carried the idea of such adjuncts with them, for even in Japan they are well known at all temples as *tori-i*, and in China as *p'ai-lus* or *p'ai-fangs*, while wooden *toranas* are to be met with in villages in Rājputāna and elsewhere down to the present day—an example of what archaeology teaches, that the present is linked to the past in one chain.

The whole of the superstructure of these Sānchī examples is so essentially wooden in character that, as Mr. Fergusson remarked, 'we rather feel inclined to wonder how men dared to attempt its erection in stone, and are equally astonished that it should have stood' for twenty centuries 'nearly uninjured.'

The remains at Sānchī, however, evidently belong to a very extended period, and there are scarcely any reliable data by which to fix the dates of the earliest structures, while much has disappeared, even during the nineteenth century, that might



have aided our knowledge. The former presence of one, if not two, Asoka pillars at the great *stūpa* would point to the *stūpa* itself being in existence in his time at the latest; the rail round it may have been added subsequently, and the gateways still later; but the inscriptions on *Stūpa* No. II are in the same characters as those of the Asoka inscriptions, and the sculptures appear to be more archaic than those on the great *stūpa*, so that this rail may be the older of the two. Yet the difference may be small, for several of the inscriptions on the large *stūpa* seem to be also of the same age.

The gateways would naturally be erected last; and on the south one we find an inscription on one of the beams stating that it was the gift of an officer under Śrī Śātakarṇi, an Āndhra king who ruled about 160 B.C. The others were probably erected not long before or after this date. Of the buildings that once covered the surrounding area, the ruins of which still remain, our information is defective; but a small temple to the south-east of the great *stūpa* is probably the oldest remaining, and may go back even to the third century B.C.

The remains of the Amarāvati *stūpa* on the lower Kistna river present a still more complicated problem, for of the original work only a few archaic sculptures have survived. Its rail, at least, must have been entirely reconstructed before our era or shortly after,—the sculptures representing the veneration of relics, &c., but no representation of the Buddha; and then about the middle or end of the second century A.D. a great 'restoration' had been effected, when what has been called the inner rail—probably a wainscoting of the *stūpa* itself—was added, consisting of marble panels sculptured with those figures of Buddha, &c., that were so much favoured by the Mahāyāna school of later Buddhism.

### *Cave Temples*

The earlier rock temples must be of about the same age as these *stūpas*. Indeed in the Barābar hills, about sixteen miles north from Gayā, we find a group of caves in three of which are short inscriptions of Asoka, dated in his twelfth and nineteenth year, and dedicating them to the Ājīvikas, who seem to have been a naked sect, founded by Makkhali Gosāla, and similar to the Jains. Close by are three more caves, dedicated to the same sect by Asoka's grandson Dasaratha about 215 B.C. The architectural features of these caves are few: they have vaulted roofs, the walls of some of them are carefully polished, and in the ends of three of the earliest are



circular chambers or shrines, the fronts of two of which are carved with overhanging eaves. In the case of the Lomas Rishi cave, the outer apartment of which is  $32\frac{1}{2}$  ft. in length, the doorway is surrounded by carving which represents in stone the form of the structural *chaityas* of the age. They were apparently constructed with strong wooden posts sloping slightly inwards, supporting longitudinal rafters mortised into their heads, while small blocks at the sides were employed to keep the roof in form. Between the main posts was a framework that served to support the smaller rafters, on which lay the roof formed of three thicknesses of plank. The form of this roof was therefore a slightly pointed arch, having a ridge along the centre. The door, like the others in this group, has sloping jambs.

Now when we compare this with the façades of other early caves, we note the identity of construction. Among these the *chaitya* caves at Kondānā, Bhājā, Pitalkhorā, and No. X at Ajantā are the oldest. The excavators had not yet learnt to carve out these halls leaving a screen wall in front, or they still preferred to retain the wooden fronts. In two of them at least—that at Bhājā and the one at Ajantā—the mortises in the floor indicate clearly where the supports of the wooden screen once stood; and in the case of the Kondānā *chaitya* the remains of the wooden framework occupying the upper portion of the façade were still in existence not very many years ago, and were supported by posts rising from the floor, the heads of which were still left. In Bhājā, Kārle, Beḍṣā, Kānheri, and other *chaityas*, the vault of the nave was ornamented by wooden ribs, as if for its support, which proves beyond doubt that these roofs were not copies of any masonry arch, but of a timber construction; and as time wore on we find these wooden ribs copied in stone in the cave temples of a subsequent date, as in some of the Junnar caves, which were possibly of Jain origin, and in the later Ajantā *chaityas*.

The next step was to make the pillars of the nave vertical—for they had sloped inwards in the earlier examples—and to carve the front in stone; and when we look at the instances of this in the *chaityas* at Kārle, Ajantā No. IX, and Nāsik, we trace the close imitation of previous forms. The arch represented on the front of the Lomas Rishi cave in Bihār continues to be sculptured in all its details in the *vihāras* and *chaityas* of Western India till a late date; and the few buildings pictured on the Sānchī gateways represent it as of the same form. Whence we perceive that every feature and



detail of the early caves is copied from a wooden original, and conclude that the early Hindus did not construct their architectural works—whether temples, monasteries, or palaces—in stone or brick, though for foundations and mere walls such materials may have been employed.

The façades of *chaitya* shrines were, from an early date, covered with sculpture—some of them very richly; and to protect them from the weather a screen was contrived and cut in the rock in front of the façade, with large windows in the upper half for the entrance of light; but, judging from what remains at Kārle and Kānheri, it seems to have been further faced by wainscoting or ornamentation of wood, or a wooden porch was added. In other cases a porch or veranda was only attached below, while a frieze projecting well forward above saved the front from the weather, as in the case of caves XIX and XXVI at Ajantā and the Buddhist *chaitya* cave at Ellora. The lighting of these chapel caves by a great arch over the entrance has attracted considerable attention, as being admirably adapted to its purpose. As Mr. Fergusson truly remarked: 'nothing invented before or since is lighted so perfectly, and the disposition of the parts or interior for an assembly of the faithful . . . is what the Christians nearly reached in after times but never quite equalled.'

The original outward form of the *chaitya* or chapel when constructed in wood was once a matter of some uncertainty, though the Rathas at Māmallapuram (Seven Pagodas), south of Madras, supplied a key—particularly those known as Sahadeva's and the Ganeśa Rath. Each of these, however, is represented as of several storeys, and has no proper interior, so that certain of the details were somewhat conjectural; but the discovery by Mr. Cousens of an ancient structural *chaitya* at Tēr in Hyderābād territory, and of others by Mr. Rea at Chezarlā and Vidyādharpuram in Guntūr District and at Guntupalle, have fully confirmed the inferences deduced from the rock-cut examples; and that at Tēr, at least, and the Vishnu Deyyanne Dewale at Polonnaruwa in Ceylon, bear ample evidence of a wooden prototype.

Besides shrines for worship excavated in the rock, such as the Buddhist and Jain *chaitya* caves, others usually known as *vihāras* were devoted to the residence of monks and ascetics. These dwellings consisted as a rule of a hall (*śālā*) surrounded by a number of cells (*Bhikshu-grihas*) or sleeping cubicles. The earliest of these is perhaps that discovered at Bhājā about



twenty-five years ago; it consists of a small hall about 17 ft. each way, with a veranda in front and eight cells irregularly arranged.

The Bhājā group of caves has very little figure sculpture—no other has less—and, but for the form of the *chaitya* cave and of the groups of *dāgabas*, it would be hard to ascribe it to any sect. But in this little *vihāra* cave, except the small rilievo *dāgabas*, alternating with Caryatids that support a cornice in the veranda, the sculptures are quite different from anything Buddhist. Over the pillar and pilaster capitals in the end of the veranda are sphinxes of Indian form—though derived from Persian prototypes; on the walls are five full-length armed figures, peculiarly dressed; and in the right end of the veranda are two large sculptures, one representing Sūrya the Sun-god in his chariot with attendants, and below a number of monsters; the other probably Indra on his elephant with a group of small figures. These seem to indicate a connexion with the Sauras or Sun-worshippers, who certainly formed an important religious sect in early times.

It can now no longer be assumed that all the earliest caves are of Buddhist origin; the discovery of this early excavation, together with the Ājīvika cave-shrines, suggests that other groups may have to be reconsidered. Certain of the excavations at Junāgarh are almost certainly Jain, and the Lonad cave may not be Brāhmanical. A fuller study of these, and of the sculptures in the excavations at Junnar and elsewhere, may yet lead to some changes in our classification.

Among those of Orissa we find no cave of the properly *chaitya* pattern; and as an inscription on the Hāthi Gumphā cave, near the east end of the Udayagiri hill, is of the reign of a king Khāravela of Kalinga (circ. 160 B.C.), a contemporary of Śātakarṇi the Āndhra king, thus bringing it to about the date of the south gateway at Sāncī, this is one of the most important data yet found for the chronology of Indian archaeology. It upsets the whole of the theories advanced in the *Antiquities of Orissa*, both as to the age and sect to which these caves belonged; for the Hāthi Gumphā and most of the others are not Buddhist but Jain caves—even the figure mentioned by Rājendrāla Mitra in the *Ananta-gumphā* as 'of Buddha' is certainly not Buddhist, nor is it integral, but probably Jain of a late date; while the sculptures in the veranda show no sign of either of these sects, and over one doorway is a representation of the Sun-god Sūrya in his chariot. These Orissa caves are of early date—some or



perhaps most of them Jain, and the rest of other Hindu sects ; but an intelligent survey of them has still to be made, and would be of very great importance to the history of Indian art.

### *Gandhāra Monuments*

We come next to a class of remains found on the north-west frontier of India, and generally known as belonging to the ancient province of Gandhāra. Most probably they date from the commencement of the Christian era till about the fourth century, and belong to the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism—a form of religion differing entirely from that early Buddhist cult which had no images of gods or saints, but paid reverence to relics and sacred symbols. Indeed, we have no very clear proof that any of the early Hindu religions had iconographic representations of their divinities.

Be this as it may, we find the first representations of Buddha and the Buddhist pantheon among the sculptures of the Gandhāra monasteries ; and the influence of classical art manifested in many of these images leaves little doubt that they were modelled after foreign and Western patterns. The Graeco-Bactrian kingdom had passed away before the appearance of these sculptures ; but Ionians and other Greeks went far and wide with their merchandise and their art-productions, and Buddhist emissaries had for long travelled westwards as far as into the Levant. But the ethical precepts of Gautama Buddha failed to satisfy the followers of the various sects that acknowledged his tenets, or those who afterwards expounded and developed them ; and the Mahāyāna schools, coming in contact with Western iconography, seem to have embraced the idea of representations for their rapidly multiplying divinities—drawn from aboriginal superstitions as well as from their own legends and imaginations. The development of this pantheon is apart, however, from that of architecture.

The structures in connexion with which these sculptures are found have unfortunately been little regarded by the excavators, whose idea was mainly, if not solely, to secure as many of the sculptures as possible, irrespective of their relations to one another or to the plans, nature, use, and construction of the buildings themselves. Besides their iconographic teaching, however, the sculptures have considerable interest ; for the scenes depicted have frequently an architectural setting or background in which we find pillars, cornices, façades, &c., represented ; while from the débris, capitals, bases, and mouldings have been saved that belonged to the structures themselves,



and these must have borne a close resemblance to the style of the buildings of the time.

The separate capitals are distinctly Corinthian, and evidently fashioned on western models, or by western artists. They are not pure Greek, nor yet of very early Roman type, as the little figures of Buddha among the foliage indicate: similar additions were made to capitals in Asia Minor at least as early as the time of Augustus, and were prevalent in other parts of the empire for two centuries afterwards; and to this period we may on other grounds refer the monasteries at Jamāgarhi and elsewhere on the north-west frontier.

Again, in the sculptures we constantly find representations of architecture, in many of which the bell-shaped Persepolitan capital is represented, and this seems to have been introduced into India at an early date, and to have spread pretty widely in modified forms; but the Corinthian form does not appear to have extended into India proper. The Persian form of capital, and such as naturally sprang from the necessities of their own wooden construction, therefore gave rise to all the capitals employed in India. The first was the earliest form used in stone architecture in India, and it continued largely in use in Northern India till after the Christian era, and among the Gandhāra monasteries so long as they existed, while in Southern India even till now modifications of wooden forms have been almost exclusively prevalent.

The façades appearing as conventional frames for sculptured scenes represent the fronts of monastic cells, and the form of the wooden framework that filled the great arched windows of the *chaitya* temples is that represented in these Gandhāra sculptures.

One other type of column, found at Shāhdheri, in the Punjab, is of the Ionic order—the base of the pure Attic type, and the capital with volutes. This is, perhaps, as old as any of the Gandhāra remains, and is a further indication of Western influences. But the remarkably classical character and interest of the Gandhāra sculptures generally makes their age a question of the utmost importance, and this has of late been approaching solution. The era in Western history when Greek art in its minor examples became an object of export; the introduction of a pantheon into Buddhism; and the dates found on, or in connexion with, several of the sculptures, if reckoned from the Sāmvat epoch of 57 B.C., all seem to converge on the period of about three centuries between A.D. 50 and 350. The monastic establishments of the Buddhists



about Peshāwar and to the west and north must have been very flourishing, and their artistic ornamentation very rich—everywhere covered with carving and gilding. The sudden appearance of representations of Buddha and numerous Bodhisattvas in these establishments, and the Hellenic impress in the sculptures, may raise the question whether iconography in its wider extent, Brāhmanic as well as Buddhist, was not imported from the West.

Probably to about the same age as the Gandhāra remains belong the *stūpas* at Mānikyāla, between the Indus and Jhelam rivers, excavated by General Ventura and M. Court about 1830. Some of them contained coins of Kanishka, and the inference is that they date from the second century; but only the great Mānikyāla *stūpa* had any portion of the outer covering left, and that seems to have been added as the facing of an envelope, 25 ft. in thickness, placed over a smaller *stūpa* at a much later date, possibly in the eighth century.

### *Gupta Architecture*

By about the fifth century the architectural forms had developed in richness of decoration and variety. For convenience the prevalent style of this later age is sometimes called Gupta, for from about A.D. 319 to 520 the principal ruling dynasty in Hindustān was that of the Guptas, but the style continued long after their extinction. The columns have higher square bases than before, and sometimes a sur-base; the capitals, which previously had a vase as the chief member, were developed by a foliated ornament, springing from the mouth of the vase and falling down upon it from the four corners, and so lending strength to the neck whilst converting the round capital into a square support for the abacus. Often, too, a similar arrangement of foliage was applied to the vase so frequently used in early bases, and this form quite superseded the Persepolitan pillar, with its bell-shaped capital, which now disappeared from Indian art. The shafts were round, or of sixteen or more sides; pilasters were ornamented on the shafts, and the *śikhharas* or spires of the temples were simple in outline, and rose almost vertically at first and curved inwards towards the summit, which was always capped by a large circular fluted disc supporting a vase, whilst the surface of the tower was covered with a peculiar sort of horseshoe diaper, which was usual in early times. This style prevailed all over Hindustān, and was continued with modifications varying with age and locality down almost to the Muhammadan conquest, being



often best marked in Jain structures. How far south it extended is uncertain; for but few examples have survived of the many that must have existed previous to the fourteenth century, when the Muslim armies desolated the Deccan and ruined the Hindu shrines.

Whether the Buddhist *chaitya* temple, with its nave and side aisles, its sacred *dāgaba* in the apse, and circumambulatory passage, was derived from an early Hindu form, or vice versa, we can trace the connexion in plan between the early Buddhist shrines and the later Jain and Hindu temples. This is, perhaps, most distinctly brought out in the old Vaishnava temple at Aihole in Dhārwar, belonging to about the year A.D. 700. There the nave has side aisles lighted through the walls of the temple, which was impossible in the rock-cut chapels; the *dāgaba*, or *chaitya* proper, is superseded by a *cella* for the image with a semicircular back, also separated from the outer wall by the continuation of the aisles in the passage for *pradakshinā* or circumambulation; this passage also is lighted from without. In front is a porch, and round the whole is a raised veranda on square pillars and plain bracket capitals. How the *śikhara* or spire and roof of this early temple were finished, we have, unfortunately, no means of knowing, as it was long since ruined to convert it into a place of defence in the troublous times of a century ago: careful removal of the débris that covers it might, perhaps, reveal part of the structure of the spire.

If we turn next to the temple of Pāpanātha or Sangamesvara, at Pattadkal, which is also of early date—leaving out of consideration the large square outer *mandapa* that has been joined to it as a great portico—we find the plan almost repeated, except that the shrine or *cella* is now square, and the passage behind it narrower than the side aisles, but still lighted as at Aihole. The next step was to widen the temple by double side aisles, as in the temple of Virūpāksha at the same place, belonging to the Dravidian style, and built in the latter half of the eighth century; and from this plan we see how readily the later temples all over the country—both Hindu and Jain—were evolved.

### *Kashmīr Architecture*

From the eighth century, if not earlier, till about the Muhammadan conquest, we find in Kashmīr and the vicinity a style of architecture having in it a certain classical element, which at once reminds us of more western forms and has little if any connexion with the art of the rest of India. No sufficiently



CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh  
complete examination has yet been made of the examples of this style, and the hypotheses of unscientific surveyors are of doubtful value. A full knowledge of the details and peculiarities of such a quasi-classical style would afford valuable data for the history of architecture in this region.

The most notable type of this Kashmīr style is the temple of Mārtand, about three miles east of Islāmābād or Anantnāg, the old capital. It stands in a court about 220 ft. by 142 ft., surrounded by the ruins of some eighty small cells, with a large entrance porch at the east end. The temple itself was 60 ft. long by 38 ft. wide, with two wings, and consisted of two apartments—a *naos* and a *cella*. The trefoiled or cusped arch on the doors of the temple and cells is a striking peculiarity of the style, and may perhaps have been derived from the section of the Buddhist *chaitya*. It is used decoratively, however, rather than constructively. The pillars and pilasters of the portico and temple bear a close resemblance to some of the later forms of the Roman Doric, and have usually sixteen shallow flutes on the shafts, with numerous members in the base and capital. A triangular pediment surmounts the doorways, and on gable-ends or projecting faces are representations of double sloping roofs, much in the style of modern Kashmīr wooden roofs, and of which many of the temple-roofs in Nepāl are also exaggerated examples. The Mārtand temple has long been roofless; but the probability is that when built in the eighth century (A.D. 725-60) it had a sloping wooden roof, while the cells surrounding the court were small enough to be covered by flat stone roofs. The name given it implies that it was a temple of the Sun, and we know that, till the eleventh century at least, the worship of the sun was very prevalent in the north-west of India.

It was contended by General Cunningham that this and other Kashmīrian temples of the class, at Avantipur, Bhan-yur, Vāngath, Pāndrethan, &c., were Nāga or snake shrines, because he supposed they had originally been surrounded by shallow basins of water, kept at a uniform level, and approached by raised pavements across the courts. But there is no proof of this; nor does their situation render it at all probable that the traces adduced in support of his theory were other than necessary drainage arrangements. Snake-worship, indeed, appears as early as the *Yajurveda*, and probably was prevalent among the original inhabitants of Kashmīr; but surrounding water was not an indication of a Nāga shrine. The sculptures here are much decayed, and have not been represented in such detail as to indicate the divinities wor-



shipped. We do know, however, from history that all the older examples must have been erected between A.D. 720 and 1000.

### *Jain Temples in Kanara*

Another departure from the style of Hindu architecture has been remarked in certain Jain temples and tombs at Mūḍbi-dri in South Kanara. These works have double and triple sloping roofs; indeed the tombs consist of a basis with quite a series of converging roofs, and remind us at once of Nepāl *chaityas* or Chinese towers. The whole style, in the form of the pillars of the temples, the blinds between them, and the reverse slope of the eaves above the veranda roof, is closely in imitation of wooden originals, and must have been copied either from a foreign source or from local wooden models; and one has only to notice the style of the native thatched dwellings to see whence these forms were directly derived. The interiors of the Kanara temples are often very rich in carving, the massive pillars being sculptured like ivory or the precious metals.

Associated with these temples are elegant monolithic pillars placed on square bases, the shafts richly carved and the capitals wide-spreading, and supporting, on four or five very small colonnettes, a square roof elaborately modelled. These *stambhas* or pillars are the representations of the early Buddhist *lāts* and other columns raised at their temples. We had an example of a Jain *stambha* in the Indra Sabha court at Ellora, and of a Brahmanical *stambha* in the court of the great Kailāsa temple there. The Jain example at Ellora was of the Svetāmbara sect, while the Kanara Jains are Digambaras, and the Kanarese columns belong chiefly to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

### *Dravidian Architecture*

It would be difficult to follow a strictly chronological order in noting the development of the Hindu styles, since, though they may have reacted on one another, they developed naturally among the various races and more or less independently. We might at this point, then, take up first either the Northern or the Southern developments.

Dravidian is a term applied to the people in Southern India who speak the Tamil, Malayālam, Telugu, and Kanarese languages, and is conveniently applied to the style of art practised over the larger portion at least of the area inhabited by this race. We may trace approximately the northern boundary of the style along the course of the Kistna river, to Dhārwar District, and thence south-east, past Vijayanagar



and to the east of Sravana Belgola and north of Mysore city westwards to the coast. Much of the Kanarese country lies to the west of this, and part of the Telugu area to the north of it. Of course examples of the style are to be found beyond this line, and of other styles within it. In this area flourished the early dynasties of Pāndyas, Cheras, and Cholas—the first in the south, the Cholas on the east, and the Cheras in the west. These families were often at war, and by the tenth century the Cholas had overcome the Cheras and, somewhat later, the Pāndyas.

The architecture of this area, however, was essentially different from that of other regions of India, and of one type, gradually changing, but becoming worse rather than better. So far as yet known, we cannot point to any building within the Dravidian area of very early date, or before the sixth or seventh century, if indeed quite so early. Yet there may be still unnoticed structures that careful survey may bring to light, and for the present the materials are not available to enable us to trace the evolution of the style.

One of the best-known groups of monuments in the southern part of the Peninsula is that of the Māmallapuram Rathes, or 'Seven Pagodas,' on the seashore to the south of Madras. They have often been figured, by Chambers, Goldingham, Babington, Braddock, &c., but the Government survey still remains unpublished. The *raths* are each hewn out of a block of granite, but none of them has ever been quite finished, nor have any of the numerous excavated caves at the same place. How this is to be accounted for we cannot explain. They have been ascribed to various dates, some too early, others very late; the most probable view, to judge from their style and the character of the alphabets in which the inscriptions on them are carved, being that they belong to the seventh century A.D. Though evidently of Brāhmanical origin, they are certainly very like Buddhist temples as we know them from the early caves and such structural examples as have been found. But their special interest lies in their being the earliest forms of Dravidian architecture. If we compare the whole arrangement of parts in the great *rath* with some of the typical Dravidian temples, we at once see how the latter have been derived from the earlier type. The square *raths* were evidently models of Buddhist *vihāras*, and became the designs from which the temples proper or *vimānas* of Southern India were for long copied; and further, the oblong *raths*, like Arjuna's, appear to have given the first form to the great gateways or *gopurams*



which are so notable a feature in the enclosures surrounding the larger Dravidian temples.

The next landmarks in Dravidian art are the temple of Virūpāksha at Pattadakal and the rock-cut example of the Kailāsa at Ellora. The latter is well-known as a great monolithic temple hewn out of the rock, and perhaps a century older than the first. Why we find a purely Dravidian style of temple so far to the north of the Tamil country is not readily accounted for. The site was in the Rāshtrakūta kingdom, but the style of work is that of the Cholas; and we ask, was this temple the sequence of a conquest, or of an alliance, or was the architect brought from the South?

Buildings of the Dravidian style are very numerous in proportion to the extent of the area in which they are found. The temples generally consist of a square base, ornamented externally by thin tall pilasters, and containing the cell in which the image is kept. In front of this may be added a *mantapam* or hall, or even two such, but they are not characteristic of the style. Over the shrine rises the *śikhara*, of pyramidal form, but always divided into storeys and crowned by a small dome, either circular or polygonal in shape. Another special feature of these temples is the *gopurams*, or great gateways, placed in front of them at the entrances to the surrounding courts, and often on all four sides. In general design they are like the *vimānas* or shrines, but about twice as wide as deep, and very frequently far more important than the temples themselves. Another feature is the cornices of double curve; in other Indian styles the cornices are mostly straight and sloping downwards.

The style is distinctly of wooden origin, and of this the very attenuated pilasters on the outer walls and the square pillars—often of small section—are evidences. But as the contemporary Northern styles are characterized by the prevalence of vertical lines, the Dravidian is marked by the prevalence of horizontal mouldings and shadows, and the towers and *gopurams* are storeyed. Then the more important temples are surrounded by courts enclosing great corridors, or *prakāras*, and pillared halls. In the early Kashmīr temples, in many of the Jain temples of Western India, at Brindāban, at the great temple of Jagannāth in Orissa, and others—probably in early times very many more—there are courts surrounded by cells; but in the great Dravidian temples, such as those at Madura, Rāmeswaram, Tinnevely, Srīrangam, Tiruvallūr, Chidambaram, Kāñchipuram (Conjeevaram), &c., the courts are very extensive,



and are one within another. This system of enclosure within enclosure, with pillared corridors, was also carried across to Siam and Kāmbōja, where the largest and most magnificently sculptured temples perhaps ever raised were executed in this Dravidian style, developed and more fully adapted to lithic materials, with complete symmetry of arrangement, a consideration disregarded in South India, where they are too often a fortuitous aggregation of parts, arranged as accident required during the long course of their erection.

The later examples of the style were overloaded with carving: every part of the building was covered with ornamentation in the most elaborate and intricate designs the artist could invent; but while the imagination may be impressed with the evidence of power and labour so lavished on ornament—much of it truly elegant—the better judgement is offended by want of architectural design in the arrangement of the constituent parts of the whole.

One of the best examples of this order is the great temple at Tanjore. It would appear to have been begun on a definite plan, and not as a series of extensions of some small temple which, by accident, had grown famous and acquired wealth by which successively to enlarge its courts, as that in Tiruvallūr seems to have grown—by a series of accretions. The body of the Tanjore temple is of two storeys and fully 80 ft. high, whilst the *śikhara* or pyramidal tower rises in eleven storeys to a total height of 190 ft. This dominates the *gopurams* over the entrances to the court in which it stands, and to an outer court, added in front of the first, but which does not, as in other cases, surround it. On the left of the principal shrine stands a smaller one of Śubrahmanya, the war-god, which is an admirable illustration of the style in its later and decorative stage, in which aspect it is as exquisite an example as exists in Southern India. The central shrine, so far as we know, was erected in A.D. 1025, and this separate one may be placed at least as late as A.D. 1150.

The Śrīrangam temple, the largest in India, is architecturally the converse of this; it is one of the latest in date, the fifth court having been left unfinished in the middle of the eighteenth century. The shrine is quite insignificant and distinguished only by a gilt dome, while, proceeding outwards, the *gopurams* to each court are each larger and more decorative than the preceding. The circumstances of successive independent additions and the ambitions of successive donors proved incompatible with any considered design or arrangement of parts.



The earlier Dravidian structures had lions or *yālīs* and elephants placed as supports for pillars; and these were gradually enlarged, made affixes to pilasters or pillars, and the animal forms multiplied and conventionalized with riders and human and other figures introduced as supporters or attendants, until about the fourteenth century or earlier they had obtained a permanent place in the architecture: at a later date figures of gods, demons, and patrons or donors sometimes took their place. Well known examples of these occur in the temples of Vellore, Madura, Vijayanagar, and Rāmeswaram.

But though we can trace the beginnings of Dravidian art back to a pretty early date, we have as yet little help in following its development up to the thirteenth or fourteenth century; and most of the temples, of which published plans and details are as yet available, belong to dates subsequent to the great Muhammadan invasions in the first quarter of the fourteenth century.

### *Chālukyan Architecture*

Leaving the Dravidian, we come to the next great architectural area—that which Mr. Fergusson has called the Chālukyan style—prevailing over the whole of the basin of the Godāvari, the northern boundary being drawn roughly from the south end of the Chilka Lake in Orissa to the north-west, following for a considerable distance the course of the Mahānadī river, along the Sātpurā Hills to the Tāpti, and then south-west to the coast, eighty miles south of Surat.

The Chālukyan dynasty, whose name is applied to this style, begins to figure in the history of the Deccan early in the fifth century. About 615, a brother of Pulikesin II, who ruled at Bādāmi, set up an eastern kingdom at Vengi, on the lower Godāvari, and about the same time another branch of the family became established in the south of Gujarāt. The area of the Chālukyan style, then, includes the Hyderābād territory, the Central Provinces, Berār, and the Marāthī and part of the Kanarese-speaking Districts of the Bombay Presidency.

In the middle of the eighth century the Rāshtrakūtas dispossessed the Chālukyas of their territories and made them feudatory; but late in the tenth century they reasserted their power, which continued for about two centuries, and was finally overthrown in A.D. 1184 by the Hoysalas, who next ruled the south-west of the earlier Chālukya domain, while the Kākatiyas had established themselves a little earlier at Warangal



to the east. Both these kingdoms were conquered about 1320 by the Muhammadans.

The earliest temples within this area, however, are not very clearly marked off from the Dravidian and the more northern styles—some of them have distinctly northern spires, and others are closely allied to the southern style; and it was perhaps only gradually that the type acquired its distinctive characteristics. Till a late date we find temples with towers differing so little in form from Dravidian *vimānas*, that, other details apart, they might readily be ascribed to that order. Unfortunately many of the finer examples must have perished during the Musalmān invasions and during the rule of the Muhammadan dynasties of Bijāpur, Gulbarga, Bidar, Hyderābād, and Burhānpur, and, as we might expect, round these cities most of the earlier works have disappeared. Still in Mysore, Dhārwar, and Belgaum, as well as in Berār and the Marāthā districts, sufficient remains still exist to illustrate the various developments of the style.

The old temple of Pāpanātha at Pattadkal presents a curious combination of styles. The body of the temple is Dravidian, and must have been a fine specimen, of as early a date as the early part of the eighth century; but the *śikhara* is a curious approximation to the form of the early Northern Hindu or Indo-Aryan order, while in details the temple shows a strong leaning to the Dravidian. One is almost tempted to suppose that the architect of the temple had died and left the spire to another who, having a preference for the northern form, had tried to adapt it to a Dravidian substructure. The temple of Virūpāksha at the same place is an excellent example of the pure Dravidian, built about A.D. 740, while close by is another that might have been transferred from Orissa.

On the temple of Kuchchimalligudi at Aihole is a somewhat similar *śikhara*. This temple is small and plain, with a sloping roof over the side aisles, and belongs to about the seventh century. The Meguti temple also at Aihole must have been a fine work, but unfortunately it has lost all above the wall heads.

Among Chālukyan temples a prevalent form is that of three shrines round one central *mandapa* or hall. The arrangement for supporting the roofs of the halls almost always follows the Dravidian mode of four pillars, or multiples of four, in squares; the device of twelve columns so disposed in a square that, omitting the corners, the remaining eight could be connected by lintels to form the octagonal base of a dome, is almost unknown. It is employed, however, in the outer hall of the great temple at Hāngal. In the Dravidian and northern temples the



projections on the walls are generally formed by increments of slight thickness added flatly to their faces, and, however thick, they are so placed as to leave the true corners of the shrines, &c., more or less recessed.

In the Chālukyan temples the corners are often made prominent by increments placed over them, or the whole plan is star-shaped, the projecting angles having equal adjacent faces lying in a circle, as in the temple of Belūr in Mysore, built about A.D. 1120; in that at Somnāthpur on the Cauvery, thirteen miles east from Mysore city, finished in A.D. 1270; in that of Kaitabheśvara at Halebīd—lately the gem of Chālukyan art, now, alas! a shapeless ruin; and in a modified form in that of Galteśvara in Gujarāt. The great temple of Hoy-sa-śeśvara at Halebīd, begun about A.D. 1250, was left unfinished at the Muhammadan conquest. It is a double temple, measuring 160 ft. by 122 ft., and is covered with an amazing amount of the richest sculpture. But the spires were never raised over the shrines. The Kedāreśvara temple at Balagāmi is perhaps one of the oldest of the style in Mysore, and there are other good examples at Kubattur, Harnhalli, Arsikere, Kōravangala, and elsewhere—surveys of none of which have been published. But the plans vary greatly. The śikhara did not preserve the southern storeyed form but was rather stepped, forming a square pyramid with breaks corresponding to the angles in the walls, and with a broad band answering to the larger face in the middle of each exposed side of the shrine.

Some of the details of this style are very elaborate: in fact, most of the finer temples were completely overlaid with sculptural ornament. The pillars are markedly different from the earlier Dravidian forms; they are massive, richly carved, often circular and highly polished. Their capitals are usually spread out, with a number of circular mouldings immediately below; and under these is a square block, while the middle section of the shaft is richly carved with mouldings in the round. In many cases the capitals and circular mouldings have been actually turned in a sort of lathe, the shaft being held in a vertical position. They are almost always in pairs of the same design, the whole effect being singularly varied and elegant.

As we see at Ajantā and elsewhere, doorways were, from a very early period, objects on which much artistic skill was lavished; and this taste was maintained in the utmost elaboration bestowed on the sculptures surrounding the doors of Dravidian and Chālukyan shrines. Pierced stone windows were employed in Dravidian temples at Pattadakal, Ellora, and other



places; but the richly carved and highly ornamented pierced windows belong specially to this style. Generally the temples stand on a terrace from 10 to 15 ft. wide, quite surrounding them, and from 3 to 6 ft. in height—a feature which adds considerably to the architectural effect. The buildings were erected without mortar, and, in the earlier examples at least, the joints were carefully fitted. The whole was covered with sculpture, often of geometric and floral patterns, intermixed with numerous mythological figures; and, in the later examples, the courses of the base were carved with the succession of animal patterns prescribed for them in the *Silpa Śāstras*. This is very fully exemplified in the great temple of Hoysalesvara at Halebīd. This temple, though unfinished, is one of the most remarkable in India, and, in an artistic sense, is unmatched in the variety of its details and the wild exuberance of fancy displayed in its ornamentation; while the combination of horizontal with strongly-marked vertical lines and the play of outline and of light and shade are hardly surpassed in any style.

Owing to our still imperfect knowledge of the antiquities in the Hyderābād territory, we can as yet refer only to a few, such as the Hanamkonda temple near Warangal, one at Buchanapalli to the west of Hyderābād, and others at Ittagi in the south-west, at Nilanga, Nārāyanpur, &c., though we know there are many other ruins all over the area that belong to this style. In the south of the Bombay Presidency we may instance those at Dambal, Rattihalli, Tiliwalli, and the large temple at Hāngal; in the Bellary District of Madras, at Magala, Kuruvatti, Nilagunda, &c.; and in Mysore those at Belūr, Somnāthpur, Halebīd, Balagāmi, Kōravangala, Harihar, and others.

### *Indo-Aryan Style of Architecture*

Of Northern India, or that area which is usually designated as Hindustān, lying to the north of the Tāpti and the Mahā-nadī rivers, the Hindu architectural style or styles, besides being more widely spread than either of the preceding, is also more varied and wanting in marked and characteristic individuality. Mr. Fergusson, whose nomenclature has necessarily become impressed upon Indian archaeology, has applied the term Indo-Aryan to the Hindu style prevailing over this area; and it would be difficult to find a better, since this type of architecture was 'invented and used in a country which Aryans once occupied, and in which they have left a strong impress of their superior mental power and civilization.'



Within this large area there are, of course, many examples of other styles, whilst south of it there are also buildings belonging to this more northern type. At Pattadakal, for example, the temple of Pāpanātha, as already noticed, has a *śikhara* belonging to this Indo-Aryan style; whilst at the same place is another temple of the early northern class, as are also the temples of Kuchchimalīgudi at Aihole, the smaller temple at Hāṅgal, and others in the northern Kanarese districts. This sporadic appearance of temples of a style removed from their proper area may be accounted for in various ways: great temples were constantly being visited by pilgrims on their way from one shrine to another, and the repute of any new fane was soon spread over all India; and thus, when a prince undertook to build a new temple, an architect (*sthapati*) of acknowledged ability might occasionally be sent for from the most distant province, and engaged to design the work, which, of course, would be in his own style. This, too, may possibly account for the mixture of styles we find in some temples.

But under this Indo-Aryan style are classified monuments of very various orders, and we might, if necessary, separate them into two or more distinct types. The characteristic that first appeals to our notice is the curvilinear spires of the temples, and next to this the absence of that exuberance of sculpture seen in the great Chālukyan temples of the South; while in many cases, as in the Jain temples, a greater central area has been obtained by arranging twelve columns so as to support a dome on an octagonal disposition of lintels. The shrines and *mandapas* are square, and only slightly modified by additions to the walls of parallel projections, which, in the earlier examples, were thin; the walls were raised on a moulded plinth (*piṭha*) of some height, over which was a deep base, the two together rising, roughly, to about half the height of the walls. Over this is the panelled face of the wall, usually of less proportionate height than in the Chālukyan style, and though devoted to figure sculptures in compartments, the tall, thin pilasters of the southern style have disappeared. Over this is the many-membered architrave and cornice, above which rise the spire and roof. The spires follow the vertical lines of the wall, and present no trace of division into storeys, but vary in details with the age. In the earlier, we have a broad band in the centre of each face, running up and curved inwards towards the summit, which was crowned by a large, fluted, circular block called *amalasiḷā*—probably mistaken for *āmalaka* (*Phyllanthus Emblica*),—the



word *amala* meaning 'pure,' 'shining.' The finial over this is the shape of a vase, known as the *kalāśa* or *karaka*. The central band on the *śikhara* was carved, usually with a reticulated pattern composed of minute arches, but occasionally interrupted by bands of larger ornament, as at Kanārak in Orissa, and on some of the Bhubaneswar temples. The corners of these spires were generally in courses, also carved in successive patterns, each third or fourth course being alike, and one of these was usually fluted if not also circular like the *āmalaka*.

What is known as the Jain style of architecture in Western India is a development or variety of this Indo-Aryan order, and was used by Hindus and Jains alike all over Rājputāna, Mālwa, and Gujarāt. It was employed in its most ornate form by the Jains in their famous marble temples on Mount Abu, and by both Jains and Hindus at Nāgdā near Udaipur, where is a group of little-known but remarkably fine deserted temples. At Gīrnār also and Śātrunjaya in Gujarāt are clusters of temples of this order; but as they are mostly restorations of earlier shrines destroyed by the Muhammadans, they are much less lavishly ornamented with sculpture. One of the most striking features of the style is the richly carved domes over their *mandapas* or porches. Nothing can exceed the elaboration and delicacy of details in the sculptured vaults of the temples at Abu and Nāgdā. These, with the diversified arrangement of variously spaced and highly ornamented pillars supporting them, produce a most pleasing impression of symmetry and beauty.

The plain of north Gujarāt was so often devastated by war from the eleventh to the fifteenth century that its more notable temples have perished, though the once magnificent Sun temple at Mudherā still witnesses in its ruins to the architectural style and grandeur of the period when it was erected. What fragments still survive there have been illustrated in the volume of the *Archaeological Survey* of that district.

Another considerable group of from thirty to forty temples in this style is found also at Khajurāho in Bundelkhand. In the early part of the last century they were much more numerous than now—many having been removed for building material. They belong to both the sects of Hinduism as well as to the Jains, and date mostly from the tenth and eleventh centuries. The older temples are covered outside and inside with the most elaborate sculptures, and architecturally they may justly be regarded as 'the most beautiful in form as well



as the most elegant in detail' of the temples of Northern India; indeed, the only others that can well be compared with them is the earlier group at Bhubaneswar in Orissa.

The temples at Bhubaneswar exhibit the Indo-Aryan style perhaps in its greatest purity, and they differ very markedly from those in the West in being almost entirely astylar—pillars having been introduced in later additions. They have the early form of *śikhara*—nearly perpendicular below, but curving in near the summit; and the crowning member has no resemblance to anything like the small domes on Chālukyan spires. The surface of the sides is entirely covered with carving in the most elaborate style, every single stone having a pattern engraved upon it; and much of the sculpture on the earlier temples is of considerable merit and much beauty of design. The older and finer ones were erected probably in the seventh and eighth centuries, and the series was continued, by additions, down to the eleventh. From the light they seem calculated to throw on the history of art, no temples in India probably would better repay a complete scientific survey, and an attempt was made in 1869 to supply this want, but the result was an unfortunate failure. The drawings made were mostly of mere details, chosen without sequence or meaning; and no plans of any of them were prepared until a second effort was made three years later, when some ground-plans on a small scale and of doubtful accuracy of detail were drawn and printed together, on two plates in the second volume of the *Antiquities of Orissa*.

The temple of Kanārak, known as the Black Pagoda, on the coast of Orissa, appears to belong architecturally to the ninth century, though it has been by some attributed to the reign of Narasimha in the thirteenth—possibly because he repaired it or made some addition. A detached *mandapa* that stood in front of it, occupying a corresponding place to that at Mudherā, was removed to Purī, in the eighteenth century, by the Marāthās. A corner of the *śikhara* was still standing in 1839, but within the next thirty years had disappeared; and the great lintel over the entrance to the principal hall, carved with the *Navagraha* or nine planetary divinities, with other parts about the doorway, had fallen or were removed, and an abortive attempt was made to carry the lintel to Calcutta. Now this famous monument, which for its size is 'the most richly ornamented building—externally at least—in the whole world,' has lately been treated in a way that has very seriously injured it. The historical and artistic interest of it and of the



two groups previously noticed cannot be fully estimated until complete surveys have been published with detailed plans and sections.

In later examples the spire is still a square curvilinear pyramid, to the faces of which are added smaller copies of the same form, carrying up the offsets of the walls; and in some examples these are multiplied to an extraordinary extent. The earlier temples were apparently astylar, then—like the southern forms—with columns arranged in the *mandapas* in groups of four, and later, especially in Western India, the larger domes on twelve pillars formed the central area of the halls. These *mandapas* in early examples were roofed with long, sloping slabs; but, to provide for carved conical roofs inside, their outer forms represented courses of masonry, which were carved,—as we find in the older temples of Kanārak and Bhubaneswar, in the mediaeval shrines at Ambarnāth, Baroli, Khajurāho, Abu, and Chitor, and in the more recent forms at Nāsik, Benares, Udaipur, Śātrunjaya, &c.

### *Muhammadian Architecture.*

What is popularly known as Saracenic architecture is the style which was adopted by the Muhammadans when they became the ruling race in India, from about the end of the twelfth century. But while largely applied to mosques and tombs, it varied much at different periods and under the various local Muslim dynasties in different parts of the country. The Delhi emperors, for the first three centuries of their domination, were of Turkī or Pathān stock, and were succeeded in the early part of the sixteenth century by the Mughal dynasty founded by Bābar, when the latter materially influenced the architectural style of the previous dynasty.

Then there were local kingdoms which had styles more or less their own: Bengal became a separate kingdom at the beginning of the thirteenth century; the Bāhmani dynasty at Gulbarga and Bīdar dates from the middle of the fourteenth century; the kingdoms of Jaunpur, Gujarāt, and Mālwa from about A.D. 1400; Bijāpur and Ahmadnagar from about 1490, and Golconda from some twenty-two years later. Exclusive of other varieties of less extent and individually not so distinctly marked off, we have thus some ten more or less fairly different styles of Saracenic structures.

In all the varieties, the distinctive features of each may be traced at once to the employment of local native Hindu



workmen, and the use of their own materials and methods. The conquerors were of Turkish descent, and apparently had strong architectural instincts; accordingly they began at once to found mosques for the glory of Islām and to mark their triumph over the idolaters.

Their first mosques were accordingly constructed of the materials of Hindu and Jain temples, and sometimes with comparatively slight alterations. The colonnade of a temple court required little more than a wall on the west side fitted with *mihrābs* or *kiblas*, and the removal of the idol shrine, to adapt it for a mosque. In other instances they demolished the temples, and, by adding to the height of the columns, obtained the greater elevation and airiness they required. Thus in the great mosque at Ajmer, erected between 1200 and 1230, three tiers of pillars are piled above one another, and the roof is largely formed of slabs from the temples to which the columns originally belonged: in plan it is an adaptation of that of a Jain temple. And in the still larger mosque at the Kutb Minār near Delhi, built about the same time—so far as it remains—we have the same features; while in both a richly carved screen of pointed arches was added in front, and the whole enclosed by massive walls. The arches, which the Muhammadans seem to have insisted on, are built after the system of the Hindu domes, of horizontal courses as far as practicable, and then closed by long slabs meeting at the apex—an evidence that the workmen, being Hindus, were unused to building arches and modified their own methods to meet the new form of construction. The arches are circular segments up to about two-thirds of their height, and constructed in horizontal courses. Above come one or two half *voussoirs*, and the head is closed in by sloping slabs.

The Kutb Minār itself is one of the finest pillars in the world. Erected by order of Altamsh (not by Kutb-ud-dīn Aibak), it was probably completed about A.D. 1231, which is the date of an inscription on the adjoining mosque. It is still about 240 ft. in height and ornamented by four projecting balconies with richly sculptured and engraved belts between, and the whole of the lower three storeys are cut up by twenty-four projecting ribs that add greatly to its beauty. Behind the north-west extremity of the Kutb mosque is the tomb of Altamsh, who died in 1236; it is thus perhaps the earliest Musalmān tomb to be found in India, and is profusely ornamented with carving, and altogether of extreme beauty



in its details. A still finer example of the Pathān style is to be seen in the eastern annex of the mosque—the splendid southern gateway or Alai Darwāza, built in 1310: this and the now ruined tomb of ‘Alā-ud-dīn Khilji, erected soon after, mark the style at the period of its greatest perfection: indeed during his reign (1296–1316), and that of Fīroz Shāh Tughlak (1351–88), palaces, forts, mosques, mausoleums, baths, universities, and all sorts of public and private buildings multiplied in an extraordinary manner. But after the death of the former, for fully a century, the Pathān buildings are marked by a stern simplicity of design and a solemn gloom and nakedness, in marked contrast to the elaborate richness of ornamentation of the preceding period. In 1321 New Delhi or Tughlakābād was founded by Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughlak I, all the buildings of which are characterized by a severe simplicity, as contrasted with those of the preceding century. The sloping walls and massive solidity of the founder’s tomb, together with the heavy towers of the fortified citadel surrounding it, form an unrivalled model of a warrior’s tomb.

But by this time the builders had got rid of the imitation arch of the Hindus, and had learnt to construct true arches, and their architecture had now developed into a new and complete style of its own. To this style belong many of the finest mausoleums of Northern India. Like that of Sher Shāh Sūrī (1540–1545), built in a spacious tank at Sasarām, which is one of the best examples, they are very often octagonal, with an outer veranda and crowned by a dome over the inner walls, and the whole surrounded by a square terrace ornamented by small pavilions at the corners. Round the drum of the domes, also, are placed octagonal kiosks that accentuate the beauty of the outline. Other examples are numerous, among which that of ‘Alā-ud-dīn Ālam Shāh at Tijāra in Alwar territory, and of Mubārak Shāh (1540–45) at Kotila near Old Delhi, may be instanced.

The Pathān mosques of the fourteenth century were as severe in the simplicity of their style as their tombs, as we may see in the Kalān mosque at Delhi, finished in the time of Fīroz Shāh in 1386. In the first quarter of the fifteenth century, however, a reaction had set in, and the later style was hardly less rich and much more appropriate for its purposes than the earlier in the end of the twelfth and early thirteenth century. The façades of the mosques became more ornamental, were often encrusted with marble, and usually adorned with rich and beautiful sculpture. Minarets had



not become a feature of the mosques, and the corners of the structure were relieved by little kiosks instead. At Ahmadābād, minarets came into use for the *mu'azzin* in the fifteenth century. The body of the mosque became generally an oblong hall, with a central dome flanked by two or four others of the same span, but not so lofty, and separated from it by an arch whose mouldings formed a principal feature of the building. The pendentives are remarkable for their variety of design and elaborateness of detail. The style in the later Pathān period, as Mr. Fergusson has remarked, was marked by a return to the elaborateness of the past, but with every detail fitted to its place and its purpose, 'and we recognize in this last development one of the completest architectural styles of the world.'

### *The Sharkī Style*

In 1397 Khwāja Jahān, who governed Jaunpur, assumed independence, and founded the Sharkī or Eastern dynasty, which ruled there for about eighty years. Of the palaces or public buildings of the Sharkī dynasty no trace is left; for Sikandar Lodī ibn Bahlol razed them all to the ground, his courtiers using the materials for building their own mansions, and what has come down to us is little more than three great *masjids*—the Jāmi, Atala, and Lāl Darwāza—besides a fort and bridge with a number of tombs. Of these mosques the cloisters that surround the open courts and the galleries within are almost purely Hindu in style, with short square pillars and bracket capitals supporting horizontal lintels, and roofs formed of flat slabs; but the gateways and principal features of the *masjids* are in a completely arched style. There is sufficient evidence that, for the earlier of these at least, the materials of Hindu temples were largely used, and the workmen were probably mostly Hindus by birth and inclined to the old trabeate forms. The fusion of the two styles was thus incomplete. The *masjid* proper consists of a central square hall covered by a lofty dome of the whole width of it, in front of which stands the great propylon, of massive outline and rising to the full height of the central dome. This propylon had a large recessed arch between the two piers at the sides, in the lower portion of which was the entrance to the mosque, whilst the upper formed a pierced screen. On each side of the dome is a compartment divided into two storeys by a stone floor supported on pillars, and beyond this, on each side, is a larger apartment covered



by a pointed ribbed vault. The gateways into the courts on the three sides were only copies on a smaller scale of the propylons of the mosques.

The whole of the ornamental work on these mosques has a character of its own, bold and striking rather than minute and delicate, though in some of the roof-panels there are designs that may bear comparison with similar patterns in Hindu and Jain shrines. The *mihrrābs* are marked by their severe simplicity; they are simply patterns of the entrances and of the niches on the outer walls, with flat backs and structural arches over them. They form a link, however, in the evolution of the favourite form under the Mughal rule.

The Sharkī buildings have been pretty fully illustrated in the volume of the *Archaeological Reports* on the subject, and need not be further described here. They afford a marked expression of strength combined with a degree of refinement that is rare in other styles. Examples of this style are met with also at Benares, Kanauj, and other places within the Jaunpur kingdom.

### *Mālwa*

Dilāwar Khān Ghorī, the governor of Mālwa, assumed independence in 1401, and the state continued under its own rulers till 1531, when it was conquered by Gujarāt, and was finally re-annexed to imperial rule under Akbar in 1570. The capital of the province had been first at Dhār; but Dilāwar Shāh resided a good deal at Māndu or Māndogarh, about 22 miles south from Dhār, placed on an elevated plateau detached from the mainland by deep ravines and surrounded by walls on the brink of the cliffs; and under the second king, Hoshang Shāh, Māndu became the permanent capital. During his reign (1405-34) the most important of the buildings were erected. Among these, which are in a modified form of the Pathān style, the finest is the great Jāmi Masjid, which was only finished by Mahmūd Shāh I in 1454. It covers a nearly square area, measuring 290 ft. from east to west by 275 ft. from north to south, exclusive of the porch on the east, which projects about 56 ft. Inside, the court is an almost exact square, about 163 ft. each way, surrounded by arches on each side of about  $12\frac{1}{2}$  ft. in span, standing on plain square piers 10 ft. high, each of a single block of red sandstone; behind these are triple arcades on the north and south, a double one on the east, and on the west the *masjid*—five arcades in depth and having three great domes



on the west side. This court, in its simple grandeur and expression of power, may be taken, as Mr. Fergusson has well remarked, as one of the very best specimens of this style now to be found in India.

The tomb of Hoshang Shāh, adjoining the west side of the Jāmi Masjid, is a fine bold specimen of a Pathān mausoleum. It was revetted both outside and inside with white marble, which, however, has much peeled off, and is now being restored. Near the mosque, on the west, is a splendid hall, 230 ft. in length by 28 ft. wide, supported by eighty-four pillars, in three rows, of which the pattern-must have been suggested by the usual forms in Hindu and Jain shrines; only on the capitals the *kirttimukh* or horned face of the Hindus has been hewn into a group of leaves of the same outline. The porch on the north side of it is purely Hindu in style.

The Delhi gate on the north of the fortifications, by which they are entered, has been a fine lofty structure, though now much ruined: it also is purely Pathān in style, but unusually elegant in proportions and decoration. Close by this gateway are the remains of an enclosure, within which are the ruins of the royal palaces—the Jahāz Mahal, the Hindola Mahal, the Tawili Mahal, and the Nahār Jharokhā, with the Champā well or *baoli*, &c. The palaces are specially interesting as remaining examples of Pathān secular architecture, though, unfortunately, no proper survey of them has as yet been published, and it is hardly possible from such sketches as have from time to time appeared to form a just estimate of them or their arrangements.

The Jahāz Mahal, the 'ship' or 'water-palace,' built between two great tanks, is the chief of these. It is a massive structure, the eastern façade being about 40 feet in height, in the centre of which is the arched entrance, faced with marble, and still in fair preservation; over it is a projecting cornice supported on brackets, above which is a bracketed balcony under an oblong pavilion. In the front of the lower storey on each side are five arches under a deep overhanging cornice, and over each end of the façade is a domed pavilion. On one side is a ruined wing of the palace branching off from it; and on the opposite side were other apartments and a stair leading up to the roof. Seen from the west, where it overhangs the lake, this is altogether a striking building, one of the most remarkable of the period, and well worthy to be the residence of an independent Pathān chief.

North of this, about a quarter of a mile, stands the Hindola



Palace, which, with its massive masonry, is in rather better preservation than the others. The sloping buttressed walls, projecting balconies, and deep-set windows of this fine building present an appearance of great strength; and the great hall within, 108 ft. in length by 22 ft. wide, its roof supported on arches, was a splendid apartment. To the north of this were the *zanāna* apartments: and at some distance to the west are the large underground cisterns and *tah-khūnas*, or hot-season retreats, of the Champā well or *baoli*. These indicate the care and taste bestowed on such appendages of a Muhammadan palace 500 years ago.

The Nahār Jharokhā Palace is to the north of the Hindola Mahal, and also within the walled enclosure; and outside is Dilāwar Khān Ghorī's mosque, the oldest in Māndu (1405), constructed of materials taken from Hindu or Jain shrines. It has, however, a simplicity of structure about it characterizing it as a typical Pathān work.

About eighty yards to the south of the Jahāz Mahal is the Tawilī Mahal, a three-storeyed building, with its rows of lofty Saracenic arches below deep stone eaves and heavy windowless upper storeys. It lies across a beautiful foreground of water and ruins.

About a mile and a quarter south of the Jāmi Masjid, on the east of a great *talāv* or lake, is a group of buildings among which is the so-called Dhāi-ka Mahal, a substantial square tomb, and the Chhotā Jāmi Masjid of Malik Mughis-ud-dīn, built in 1432 largely with materials taken from Hindu or Jain shrines, as the pillars in the porch and colonnade bear witness. This mosque must have been one of great beauty and interest; its entrance porch, though in ruins, being still an elegant structure. Opposite to it is the ruin of Malik Mughis-ud-dīn's palace, and also, a little farther off, his tomb, the dome still enlivened by a belt of blue enamel.

Still more to the south are the remains of the palace of Bāz Bahādur, the last king of Mālwa, — which was built apparently by Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn Khiljī in 1509, and of which some portions of the courtyards remain intact, as well as the cupolas over the colonnades. On the hill above is what is now known as Rūpmatī's *chhatrī*, still in fair preservation.

Here, as elsewhere, the available materials have exercised a marked influence upon the architecture; the prevalence of a red sandstone is emphasized in the piers of the Jāmi Masjid — more than 300 of them being each of a single block of this material; and for more decorative purposes marble, both



white and coloured, was freely used to revet the walls and piers. An adequate survey of the remains at Māndu, and of a few others of the same age in Mālwā, would form an interesting monograph on this style of architecture, together with its constructional methods, which deserve attention and study. We have here a strictly arcuate style, without admixture of the general trabeate structural methods followed by the native Hindus; and while at Jaunpur and Ahmadābād, at the same period, we find the strong influence of native methods copied in the Muhammadan architecture, at Māndu the borrowing or imitating of such forms seems to have been suppressed, and the builders clung steadily to the pointed arch style, without any attempt, however, at groining—so successfully employed at a later period by the Mughal architects.

### *Bengal*

The Bengal province was placed under governors appointed from Delhi as early as A.D. 1194, the first of these being Muhammad-i-Bakhtiyār, under the emperor Kutb-ud-dīn Aibak. In 1282 Nāsir-ud-dīn Bughra Khān, the son of the emperor Ghiyās-ud-dīn Balban, was appointed governor and the office became hereditary in his family. In 1338 Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak slew the governor Kādir Khān and assumed sovereignty, but was successfully opposed by 'Alī Mubārak, who reigned from 1340 to 1346. He was assassinated by Shams-ud-dīn Ilyās Shāh, who then defeated Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Ghāzī Shāh in 1352, and may be regarded as the founder of the Purbiya dynasty, which ruled Bengal for about a century and a half, or till 1487, when the throne was usurped by Habshis and subsequently by 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh III. But in the reign of his son, Mahmūd Shāh III, Sher Khān, the Afghān ruler of Bihār, invaded Bengal in 1537 and laid siege to Gaur, which was then completely sacked, and this once great and wealthy city, thus plundered, began to decay and its buildings were neglected. The kingdom was annexed by the great Akbar in 1573, and the city was depopulated by plague in 1575.

But long before the advent of the Muhammadans, Gaur, or Lakhnauti, had been the capital of the Pāl dynasty in the ninth and tenth centuries and of the Sens of Bengal in the twelfth century; it was then of great extent, and doubtless contained many temples and palaces that were destroyed by the Muslims. As the country is practically without stone, they would be mostly of brick and would afford material for the conquerors;



but probably pillars, images, and details were of that hornblende, basalt, or hard potstone, which takes a high polish and is employed in the later structures. In the Eklākhi mosque or tomb (A.D. 1414) at Pandua, and in the Chhoti Sonā Masjid at Gaur (circ. 1500), the stones used have largely been taken from earlier Hindu buildings. The use of brick forced the builders to elaborate a local arched style of their own, and further, as Mr. Fergusson pointed out, to introduce a new mode of roofing, which, though but little agreeable to our tastes, came to be regarded by the natives, whether Hindu or Muhammadan, as a most elegant form, and spread, in the seventeenth century, as far up the Gangetic valley as Delhi, and a little later, even to Amritsar. The curvilinear form given to the eaves, descending at the corners of the structure, was almost certainly suggested by the form of the huts, constantly roofed with bamboo and thatch, in which the Bengalis always use a curvilinear form of roof.

The erection of large buildings of brick required heavy piers for the arches and thicker walls than those constructed entirely of stone. Such piers and walls, when enriched by a casing of moulded tiles, would appear still heavier; and for tiles, when opportunity offered, a facing of carved stone might be substituted. This was doubtless the kind of buildings before the Muhammadan conquest, and the style was only modified by that event; hence this Bengal style is not like any other, but a purely local one, with heavy short pillars faced, at least, with stone, supporting pointed arches and vaults of brick.

Ilyās Shāh (1345) made Pandua, to the north of Gaur in Mālda District, his capital, and there his son and successor, Sikandar Shāh (1358-89) built the great Adina Masjid within the first ten years of his reign. It measures nearly 500 ft. in length by 285 ft. from east to west, containing in the centre a court measuring nearly 400 ft. by 154 ft., surrounded by a thick curtain wall of brick, pierced by eighty-nine arched openings, with one on the west side much wider and more dignified than the others. The roof was supported by 266 stone pillars—the cloisters on three sides had a double row of pillars in each—that on the west, or the mosque proper, having four rows of pillars and thirty-five *mīhrābs* on the west wall. The pillars are about 2 ft. square at the base and 10 ft. 5 in. high, some consisting of one block of hornblende, but wanting in variety of pattern. North of the central *mīhrāb* is a platform known as the Bādshāh-ka takht, that is, the *mulūk khāna*, or



royal gallery. This is supported by twenty-one short pillars of a much heavier form, and has others of a better type above. The roof consisted of 378 domes, all of the same form and construction. Such a design has little architectural merit, though its size and the elegant richness of its details make it an interesting study; and the same character runs through most of the works of these Purbīya rulers.

Next to the Adīna Masjid comes the Eklākhi mosque or tomb, at a distance of about two miles to the south-west. It is said to be the tomb of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Azim Shāh (1390-7), but there is no inscription to show this, and it may have been the work of Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad Shāh (1414-43), who was a great builder. It is 80 ft. square and covered by one dome. Much of the materials have been taken from Hindu temples, the structure being built of hornblende slabs and brick, with much embossed brick used in the decoration. It has richly carved buttresses at the corners, reminding one of the bases of minarets, but they had only a capstone above the level of the roof, the corners of which curve downwards on each face. Though much smaller, this was altogether a bolder and architecturally finer structure than the Adīna Masjid.

To the south-west of the preceding is the Sōnā Masjid, a small but once elegant mosque, built of hornblende or, perhaps, basalt. It has five arched doorways, and was roofed by fifteen brick domes, but the trees that were allowed to take root in them have wrought its destruction.

Five miles south of Pandua is Mālḍa, where also are remains of mosques, tombs, and gateways belonging to the times of the Purbīya rulers.

Among the ruins of the once great city of Gaur, six miles south-east of Mālḍa, are more interesting remains, of the same style and period. Of these may be instanced the Dākhil or Salāmī gateway, the north entrance into the fort, supposed to have been built by Rukn-ud-dīn Bārbak Shāh (1460-74)—as grand a structure of the kind as is to be found anywhere. It is built of small bricks, decorated with embossed terra-cotta facings, is 70 ft. across the façade, with a depth of 110 ft., having rooms for the guard on each side the passage and lofty towers at the corners, whilst a recessed arch 34 ft. high encloses the entrance on each face.

Just outside the fort to the east is a *minār*, about 85 ft. in height and 21 ft. in diameter, which, for two-thirds of its height, is a polygon of twelve sides, and above that contracts and is



circular. Probably a platform some 15 ft. in height once surrounded the base, but it has entirely disappeared, and the door is now at a considerable height from the ground. Inside, a spiral stair leads to the small chamber on the summit, once roofed by a dome. At one time this tower was encompassed by a revetting of stone, and the cupola was covered with blue and white tiling, but now these are entirely gone. Indeed, most of the tiles with which the mosques and tombs at Gaur and Pandua were originally ornamented have long since disappeared, for (as mentioned in Grant's *Fifth Report*, p. 285) the *Nizāmat daftar* contained an entry of 8,000 rupees under the head of *kīmat khishtkār*, annually levied from a few landholders who had the exclusive right of 'dismantling the venerable remains of the ancient city of Gaur or Lakhnauti, and conveying from thence a particular species of enamelled bricks, surpassing in composition the imitative skill of the present race of native inhabitants.'

This *minār* Mr. Fergusson regarded as a Jayastambha or pillar of victory, comparing it with the Kutb Minār at Delhi, that raised by Ghiyās-ud-dīn Balban at Koil in 1253, and one at Daulatābād with a high marble platform round it. This was erected by Saif-ud-dīn Fīroz Shāh II (1488-90); and it may be remembered that about 1443 Mahmūd Khiljī, after his victory over the Rājputs at Kumbhalmīr, erected a tower of victory at Māndu faced with marble; and again on Rānā Kūmbha gaining a victory over Mahmūd he erected the fine Kīrtti-stambha at Chitor, 1448-58.

Among the mosques at Gaur the Kadam Rasūl Masjid at the south-east gate of the fort is the only one at all cared for, because it contains a stone bearing the supposed impression of Muhammad's footprint, brought from Madīna by Husain Shāh (1493-1519). The mosque was built by his son Nusrat Shāh, A.D. 1530. It has three arched entrances in the front, separated by massive piers, and is about 35 ft. in length inside; the central portion of the roof is covered by a single dome, and it had four minarets at the corners, the upper portions of stone, of which only one survived into the last century. The façade is relieved by horizontal mouldings and panels of moulded brick, and string-courses of the same extend its whole length.

South from this is the half-fallen Tāntipāra mosque, which must have been a building of considerable architectural merit. The *mīhrābs* are elegantly carved, the roof was supported by massive stone pillars, and the façade richly



decorated with ornamental terra-cotta facing. It is ascribed with probability to Yūsuf Shāh, about A.D. 1480.

Southwards from this again is the Lattan or 'painted mosque,' so called from its walls being cased inside and out with glazed tiles of different colours—dark blue, green, yellow, and white, admirably arranged for effect in varied patterns. The exterior has been much defaced, but inside, if still in fair preservation, it is fast going to decay. It has four entrances in each end as well as in front; and eight double buttresses relieve the exterior by their mouldings and encrusted tile decoration. It is also ascribed to the reign of Yūsuf Shāh in 1475.

The Kotwālī Darwāza is a handsome and imposing gateway of brick, leading from the south side of the old city, and, except above, is in pretty good preservation. To the apex of the arch is 31 ft., the depth is 51 ft., and on the south it was provided with semicircular abutments on each side for the military guard.

About two miles farther south is the Khwāja-kī Masjid, known as the Chhoti Sonā Masjid, built by Walī Muhammad during the reign of Husain Shāh, that is, in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Constructed entirely of hornblende, which has been largely taken from earlier Hindu temples, it is in fairly good preservation—better than any other in Gaur. Inside it is divided lengthwise into three aisles, and five across, the arches over which rise on somewhat massive stone pillars to a height of 20 ft., and above this are the fifteen domes. The five *mihirābs* are of black hornblende, and were once gilt; while in the north-west corner is a carved *takht* or throne. It is ornamented outside by carving in low relief, of most elaborate and artistic designs, and inside it is beautifully finished. In this mosque and the next we have the style probably at its best.

The Sonā Masjid, outside the fort to the north-east, is perhaps the finest memorial left at Gaur. Built by Nusrat Shāh in 1526, it was 170 ft. in length by 76 ft. deep, with walls 8 ft. thick, faced inside and out with hornblende. In front it has eleven arched entrances,  $8\frac{1}{2}$  ft. wide and 14 ft. high. These lead into a corridor, the arches of which support the twelve domes of its roof. Within this is the *masjid*, of which the whole roof has now fallen: it had three aisles in length, supported by twenty pillars, and had eleven *mihirābs* in the west wall. At both sides of the end doorways to the corridor and at the back corners were



polygonal *minārs* of brown basalt, but how far they rose above the walls is uncertain. The front had carved panels between the doorways and mouldings above them. From its massive solidity and size this must have been an imposing building. Indeed, this characteristic of the Gaur buildings stands out in striking contrast to the somewhat slight architectural arcades of much of the Saracenic architecture.

Perhaps nowhere else, even in India, is the effect of unchecked luxuriant vegetation upon the most substantial structures to be seen in a more striking and withal melancholy scale than in the vast mass of ruins that run almost continuously for more than twenty miles from Pandua to Madhāpur. But besides these remains, there are other examples of this style scattered over the area of what was the Bengal kingdom of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. And the style was continued by the natives, whether Hindu or Muhammadan, and employed with excellent effect in temples of later date, as in that of Kānta at Kāntanagar near Dinājpur, erected 1704-22, or in the now-ruined one of Rās Mohan at Gopālganj near the same place, built in 1754; the latter has twelve sides, but is cramped in plan, which is sacrificed to excessive ornament.

### *Gulbarga and Bidar*

The Bahmani dynasty, founded by Hasan Gangū Bahmani in 1347, had Gulbarga for its capital till about 1428, when it was transferred to Bidar, a little over sixty miles to the north-east. This kingdom stretched from Berār to the Kistna river and from the Telingāna or Warangal territories on the east to the Arabian Sea on the west, and in the latter half of the fifteenth century it included all the Western Deccan from Mysore to Gujarāt.

During the eighty years (1347-1428) that Gulbarga was the capital, it was adorned with important buildings, of which the most notable now remaining is the great mosque, one of the most striking in India. It measures over all 216 ft. from east to west by 176 ft. from north to south, 45 ft. on the west being occupied by the *masjid* proper. It differs from all the great mosques in India in having the whole central area covered over—as in the great mosque at Cordova—what in others would be an open court of about 126 ft. by 100 ft., being roofed by sixty-three small domes. The light is admitted through the side-walls, which are pierced by great arches on all sides except the west. This plan protects the wor-



shippers from the heat and glare of the Indian sun. The central area of the *masjid* is covered by a dome about 40 ft. in diameter, raised on a clerestory, and the side sections by six small domes each, whilst at each end of the corridors are domes of the width of 25 ft. The style is plain and substantial, with but little ornament, and it is built wholly of original materials.

In the east of the town are the tombs of the Bahmani kings—massive square-domed structures with handsome stone tracery on their outer walls, and elaborately finished inside; they are now used as State offices. Farther out is the shrine of Banda Nawāz, built about 1640, and other *dargāhs* are close by.

On the removal of the capital to Bidar, mosques, palaces, and *dargāhs* were erected there also, of which most have perished. In the citadel the most entire, perhaps, is the mosque, which is 295 ft. in length by 77 ft. deep, with nineteen arched entrances in front, and inside eighty round piers, each  $4\frac{1}{4}$  ft. in diameter, which support the groins of the roof. In the middle, enclosing the *mihirābs* and a pulpit of three steps, is an apartment 38 ft. square, which is carried up as an octagon a storey above the roof of the mosque, and covered by a large dome. Parts of the roof—which was covered by some eighty-four small domes—have fallen in.

During the reign of Muhammad Shāh II, Khwāja Mahmūd Gilanī (or Gāwān), an old noble, in 1478–9 built a *madrasa* about 180 ft. by 205 ft., with lofty *minārs* at the corners of the east face. This must have been a striking building, three storeys in height, with the towers, if not the whole façade, covered with enamelled tiles. In 1656 the city was taken by Aurangzeb, and the *madrasa* was appropriated as a cavalry barrack, and part of it as a powder magazine, which exploded and wrecked the building.

In 1492 the rule was seized by Kāsim Barīd, who really founded a new dynasty, his son, Amīr Barīd Shāh, assuming the title of king. The *dargāh* of the latter, about half a mile to the west of the city, stands on a large solid platform, and is nearly 57 ft. square, with walls 9 ft. 8 inches thick, rising to a height of 57 ft. from the platform, crowned with a sort of honeysuckle border, and the dome is about 37 ft. in height. The dome is ornamented inside with belts of coloured tiles, and further decorated with interlaced Arabic sentences.

The ten tombs of Bahmani kings, about five miles north-east from the city, are of the like pattern and of considerable



splendour, the largest being that of Ahmad Shāh I, who died in 1435. They are not much ornamented, but are structurally good, and impressive by their massive proportions.

### Gujarāt

Of the style of Gujarāt Mr. Fergusson has truly remarked, that 'of the various forms which the Saracenic architecture assumed, that of Ahmadābād may probably be considered as the most elegant, as it certainly is the most characteristic of all. No other form is so essentially Indian, and no one tells its tale with the same unmistakable distinctness.' It is the less necessary to enter into detail regarding this style of architecture, since it is one of the very few that have as yet been treated with anything approaching to fullness, in three volumes of the *Archaeological Survey of Western India*.

The Hindu kingdom of Gujarāt had been in a high state of civilization before its subjugation by the Muhammadans, and the remains of their temples at Sidhpur, Pātan, Modherā, and elsewhere testify to the building capacity of the race. Under Muhammadan rule they introduced forms and ornaments into the works they constructed for their rulers, superior in elegance to any the latter knew or could have invented. Hence there arose a style combining all the beauty and finish of the previous native art with a certain magnificence of conception which is deficient in their own works. The elevations of the mosques have usually been studiously arranged with a view to express at once the structural arrangements, and to avoid monotony of outline by the varied elevation of each division. Instead of the propylon of the Sharkī style, the central portion of the façade was raised by a storey over the roof of the wings, and to this was attached two richly carved minarets, rising in the very earliest mosques only as small turrets above the façade, but soon after to towers of considerable height. The central dome was raised over a gallery above the central part of the hall by two rows of dwarf pillars, of which the outer row was connected by open stone trellis-work, admitting a subdued light and providing perfect ventilation. This second storey rose to about the height of the central facade, and upon it was the principal dome.

By and by the style changed much: the arched entrances in front were often omitted, and only a screen of columns formed the façade, the minarets being removed to the corners, and were no longer for the *mu'azzin* but only architectural ornaments. This was partly a return to the Indian trabeate



construction, and it was carried out in its best form in the Sarkhej group of buildings belonging to the second half of the fifteenth century.

The Muhammadan architecture of Gujarāt is notable for its carved stonework; and in the perforated stone windows in Sidi Saiyid's mosque, the carved niches in the *minārs* of many other mosques, and the sculptured *mihirābs* and domed and panelled roofs, we have ornamental work that will stand comparison with, and much of it will rival, anything of the kind employed elsewhere in any age.

Their tombs were a natural product of the style. There were many brick mausoleums, like that of Daryā Khān and of Āzam and Muazzam Khān, just as there were brick mosques like 'Alif Khān Bhūkāi's at Dholkā; but all the stone tombs were pillared pavilions of varying dimensions, the central area over the grave covered by a dome standing on twelve pillars. These pillars were connected by screens of stone trellis-work carved in ever varying patterns, and round this there might be a veranda with twenty pillars in the periphery, or a double aisle with thirty-two in the outer square. And as these were irregularly spaced in order to allow the inner twelve to support the lintels of a regular octagon for the dome, the monotony of equal spacing was avoided. In larger tombs, as in Saiyid Usmān's, the dome was supported on a dodecagon, and coupled pillars introduced for structural purposes also increased the variety of aspect. The finest example that has come down to us of this class is the tomb of Mubārak Saiyid, erected at Mahmudābād in 1484, which is wholly in the earlier arched style and one of the most splendid sepulchres in India, simple in plan, with a solidity and balance of parts about the whole that has rarely been equalled.

The step-well or *wāv* of Bāi Harīr, though a Muhammadan work, is strictly Hindu in design, and almost a copy of another at Adālaj; but it is ornamented with pillars and galleries having carved wall panels in every way as the mosques are. The sluices, too, of the great artificial tanks are really works of art—designed in suitable forms, and highly ornamental.

### *Bijāpur*

The Musalmān dynasties of the Deccan were short-lived, and about the same time that the Barīd Shāhis supplanted the Bahmanis at Bīdar, the Nizām Shāhis set up as rulers at Ahmadnagar; and in 1492 Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh, a Turk—said to have been a son of the Ottoman Sultān Murād II—who had



found service under Amīr Barīd, founded the kingdom of Bijāpur. The Berār and Golconda kingdoms arose respectively before and after this; but of their architecture we have as yet no really satisfactory survey. Of Bijāpur we have the excellent accounts by Fergusson, Capt. Hart, and Meadows Taylor (1859 and 1866). It is, therefore, the less necessary to enlarge upon it.

The foreign origin of the 'Ādil Shāhī dynasty, and their partiality for the Shīah form of Islām prevailing in Persia rather than the Sunni, together with their ready employment of Persian officers, probably influenced their architecture, and led to that largeness and grandeur which characterized the Bijāpur style.

About twenty years ago the Bombay Government adapted a number of these old buildings to modern requirements: the Bukhāra Masjid has been used as a post office, and the mosque belonging to Muhammad's great tomb was turned into a travellers' resthouse, but has recently been restored; then the 'Adālat Mahal was converted into the Collector's residence; the Chīnī Mahal into public offices; Yāqūt Dabālī's mosque into a residence for the Assistant Collector; Khawāss Khān's *dargāh* and mosque into house and office for the Executive Engineer; the Chhotā Chīnī Mahal into a house for the Police Superintendent; and the 'Arash Mahal into the Civil Surgeon's residence.

The more notable buildings now left at Bijāpur are the Jāmi Masjid, begun by 'Ālī 'Ādil Shāh (1557-79), and his unfinished tomb; the Gagan Mahal (1561); the Mihtar Mahal; the Ibrāhīm *rauza* and mosque (1580-1627); the 'Asar Mahal; and the Gol Gumbaz or great tomb of Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh (1626-56).

The style of the buildings differs markedly from those of Agra and Delhi, but is scarcely, if at all, inferior in originality of design and boldness of execution. There is no trace of Hindu forms or details; the style was their own, and was worked out with striking boldness and marked success. The mode in which the thrusts are provided for in the giant dome of Muhammad's tomb, by the use of massive pendentives, hanging the weight inside, has drawn the admiration of European architects. And this dome, rising to about 175 ft. from the floor, roofs an area 130 ft. square, covering 2,500 sq. ft., larger than the Pantheon at Rome, where stability is secured only by throwing a great mass of masonry on the haunches, and so hiding the external outline.

The plan of the Jāmi Masjid is of the usual form, except



that the east wall and corridor was never built ; but, notwithstanding, it is one of the finest mosques in India. It was commenced early in the reign of 'Āli 'Adil Shāh I (1557-79). The *masjid* proper is about 240 ft. in length by 130 ft. deep, divided longitudinally into five aisles, by nine across ; but the centre, occupying a square space of three bays each way, is covered by the great dome, supported in the same way as that over Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh's, rising to a height of about 96 ft. inside, and is the earliest example of this style of dome—being nearly a century earlier than that on the great tomb. The court is about 187 ft. from east to west, and has a corridor on the north and south sides. At the east corners two *minārs* were to be erected, but only that on the north was properly begun. At a later date the court was extended eastwards, and a large gateway constructed about 115 ft. in advance of the original court, with part of a corridor on the south of it.

In the Gagan Mahal, again, the central arch has a span of 61 ft., but the whole structure is ruined, and the wooden roof, &c., were carried off by the Marāthās. The Asar Mubārak, too, is largely of wood, the façade being open, with two wooden pillars supporting the roof, while inside the decoration was of the same material and richly painted. Again, in the Mihtar Mahal—really a splendid gateway to a mosque—and in the Ibrāhīm *rauza* group, we have every detail of the structure in stone covered with the most delicate and exquisitely elaborate carving, the windows filled with tracery, and cornices supported by wonderfully rich brackets. In the *dargāh*, too—as if in defiance of constructional demands—the room, 40 ft. square, is covered by a perfectly level stone roof, supported only by a cove-bracketing from the walls on each side.

### *Mughal Saracenic Style*

The Mughal phase of Indian Saracenic architecture began under Bābar (1526-31), but we have no important work of his left, nor of his son Humāyūn. The first examples of the style belong to the time of Sher Shāh (1539-45), one of the most characteristic of which is the Kila-kohna or Sher Shāh Masjid (1541) at Purāna-Kila, near Delhi, and there are a few other fragments there and at Rohtās. But though the later developments of the style in the rich remains at Delhi, Agra, Fatehpur Sikri, and some other places have been largely surveyed and illustrated, these earlier structures, though so interesting as the initial forms of the style, have hitherto been neglected for the



more ornamental examples of later date. The first, too, seems to have suffered most under our own rule. During the whole period of the Mughal dynasty, as Mr. Fergusson has well remarked, there is a 'unity in the works and a completeness in their history which makes the study of their art peculiarly fascinating; and some of their buildings will bear comparison, in some respects, with any architectural productions in the world.'

With the emperor Akbar (1556-1605) the Mughal styles made a great advance; he built very largely, and art was living and developing so vigorously during his long reign that it would be difficult to enumerate all the peculiarities of his numerous buildings. As in the Gujarāt and other styles, there is a combination of Hindu and Muhammadan features in his works which were never perfectly blended. Like their predecessors, the Pathāns, the Mughals were a tomb-building race, and those of the latter are even more splendid than those of the former, more artistic in design, and more elaborately decorated. The most splendid of these, and the most renowned building in India, is the far-famed mausoleum, the Tāj Mahal at Agra—the tomb of Mumtāz Mahal, the wife of Shāh Jahān; it is surrounded by a garden, as were almost all Muslim tombs.

In the fine tomb of his father Humāyūn, and at Fatehpur Sikri, Akbar's buildings are best seen; and as the latter have been well illustrated by Mr. Ed. W. Smith, in four volumes of his *Survey Reports*, it is unnecessary here to enter upon details. Three small pavilions, said to have been built for three of his wives, are gems of picturesque structures, carved and ornamented to the greatest extent without being in the least overdone, and are unsurpassed by anything of the kind elsewhere. Then the great mosque is scarcely matched in elegance and architectural effect; the south gateway is well-known, and from its size and structure excels any similar entrance in India. Akbar's pavilion, the Chālīs Sitūn at Allahābād, was destroyed for materials to repair the fortifications; but his tomb at Sikandra near Agra is a unique structure of the kind and of great merit, the plan probably suggested by some native design.

With Akbar's death the style underwent a change: the Hindu features disappeared entirely, as if outgrown. Jahāngir made Lahore his principal residence, and Agra and Delhi have little to show belonging to his rule. His great mosque at Lahore is in the Persian style, covered with enamelled tiles; his tomb near by (1630-40) was made a quarry of by the Sikhs from which to build their temple at Amritsar; and the



capital he built at Dacca in Bengal, being mostly of brick-work, in so moist a climate, has gone to utter decay. At Agra, the tomb of I'timād-ud-daula belongs to this reign, and being built entirely of white marble and covered wholly by *pietra dura* mosaic, it is one of the most splendid examples of that class of ornamentation anywhere to be found.

Under Shāh Jahān (1628-58) a remarkable change came over the style: its force and originality gave way to a delicate elegance and refinement of detail. This is well illustrated in the magnificent palaces he built at Agra and Delhi—the latter once the most exquisitely beautiful in the East. Unfortunately, no adequate survey of what remains of these buildings has yet been published. Of the Tāj Mahal (1632-54), fortunately so well preserved, nothing need be added; its extreme delicacy, the richness of its material, and the complexity of its magnificent design have been dwelt on by writers of all countries. So also of the surpassingly pure and elegant Motī Masjid in the Agra Fort, all of white marble: it is among the gems of the style. The Jāmi Masjid at Delhi (1650-66) is a really imposing building, and its position and architecture have been carefully considered so as to produce a pleasing effect and feeling of spacious elegance and well-balanced proportion of parts. In his works Shāh Jahān presents himself as the most magnificent builder of Indian sovereigns.

With the reign of Aurangzeb (1658-1707) the decline of taste set in at once. He was more disposed to insult the religion of the Hindūs than to glorify his reign by splendid monuments; and with all his fanaticism on behalf of Islām, it is said he lowered the *nimbars* of the mosques that the *khatibs* might not stand in a commanding position in his presence. With little true reverence, it was hardly to be expected he should delight in architectural magnificence. Spending much of his time in camps, he built no palace of importance; the tomb of his favourite wife at Aurangābād—vulgarly believed to be like the Tāj at Agra—is commonplace to a degree, and he erected no tomb for himself, though he lived to a great age. The works of his reign seem mostly to have shared in the same decline of style: squared stone and marble gave way to brick or rubble with stucco ornament.

The buildings at Seringapatam and Lucknow are of still later date and are in certain respects imposing, but in detail are often tawdry. Yet architecture is not dead in India. Even in recent years there have been erected tombs and temples of purely native origin and of much elegance in detail,



while retaining the essential elements of structural design; in others again, these elements have parted company, and no amount of elegant ornament can compensate the want of propriety in such structures. Otherwise the imitation of a foreign style is rapidly proving fatal to indigenous art.

Much remains to be done to make us fully acquainted with Indian architecture in its many and interesting phases, more especially in Hindustān or India north of the Vindhya range, and in the extreme South as well as in Hyderābād territory. In the North there has been too little system in the surveys; we want a few monographs on entire styles and districts to enable us to grasp their real merits and characteristics. Surveys of buildings here and there without any links of architectural or historical connexion may serve to illustrate the traveller's route, but contribute little to a full or scientific delineation, the publication of which is a serious desideratum.

JAS. BURGESS.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Capt. Ernest Barnes.—'Dhar and Mandu,' in *Jour. Bombay B. R. As. Soc.*, vol. xxi, pp. 339-391.

Capt. Blake.—*History of Mandu, the ancient Capital of Malwa*. Bombay, 1844; reprint. 1879.

J. W. Brecks.—*An Account of the Primitive Tribes and Monuments of the Nilagiris*. 4to. London, 1873.

J. Burgess.—*The Rock-cut Temples of Ajanta*. Pamphlet, 1868.—*The Temples of Satruñjaya*, photographed by Sykes and Dwyer, with historical and descriptive introduction (one plate and forty-six photographs). Atlas fol. Bombay, 1869. Reprint of Text. 8vo. Ahmadabad, 1878.—*Notes of a Visit to Somanāth, Gīrnār, &c., in Kāthiāwād*. 18mo. Bombay, 1869.—*Notes of a Visit to Gujarāt*. 12mo. Bombay, 1870.—*Photographs from Somanāth, Gīrnār, Junāgadh, &c., in Kāthiāwād*, with descriptive Text. Bombay, 1870.—*The Rock-cut Temples of Elephanta or Ghārāpurī*. Illustrated (with drawings and photographs) 8vo and oblong fol. Bombay, 1871.—*Photographs of Architecture and Scenery in Gujarāt and Rājputāna* (by Bourne and Shepherd), with historical and descriptive letterpress. Fol. Calcutta, 1874.—*Report of the Archaeological Survey in Belgaum and Kaladgi Districts*. Roy. 4to. London, 1874.—*Report of the Archaeological Survey: Kāthiāwād and Kachh*. Roy. 4to. London, 1876.—*The Rock-cut Temples of Elura or Verul*, with twelve photographs. Cr. 8vo. Bombay, 1877.—*Report of the Archaeological Survey: Bidar and Aurangābād*. Roy. 4to. London, 1878.—*Notes on the Rock-temples of Ajanta and their Wall-paintings*. Demy 4to. Bombay, 1879.—*Inscriptions, &c., from the Cave-temples of Western India*. Demy 4to. Bombay, 1881.—*Notes on the Amarāvati Stūpa*. 4to. Madras, 1882.—*Buddhist Cave-temples and Brahmanical and Jaina Caves in Western India*. 2 vols. Roy. 4to. London, 1883.—*List of Antiquarian Remains in the*



*Bombay Presidency.* Demy 4to. Bombay, 1885: 2nd ed., revised by H. Cousens. 1897.—*Buddhist Stūpas of Amarāvati and Jaggayyapeta*, Roy. 4to. London, 1887.—'Archaeological Research in India,' *Actes du Congrès Int. des Orientalistes*, 1889.—*Epigraphia Indica*, vols. i and ii. 4to. Calcutta, 1891-4.—*Muhammadan Architecture of Bharoch, Cambay, Dholka, &c., in Gujarāt.* Roy. 4to. London, 1896.—*The Ancient Monuments, Temples, Sculptures, &c., of India.* Pt. i, 170 plates. Fol. London, 1897.—*Muhammadan Architecture of Ahmadabad.* 2 vols. Roy. 4to. 1900-5.—*Buddhist Art in India*, translated from A. Grünwedel's *Handbuch*, revised and enlarged: 154 illustrations. 8vo. London, 1901.—'Indian Architectural Details.' *Jour. of Indian Art*, vol. iii, No. 32, fifteen plates. Fol. London, 1890.—*The Gandhāra Sculptures*, twenty-five plates and thirty-eight text-blocks. *Ibid.*, vol. viii, pp. 23-40 and 73-92.—'The Great Stūpa at Sānchi-Kānākheda.' *Jour. R. As. Soc.* 1902, pp. 29-45.—'Sketch of Archaeological Research in India during half a century.' *Jour. Bom. B. R. As. Soc.* Centenary vol., 1905, pp. 131-148.

J. Burgess and H. Cousens.—*The Antiquities of Dabhoi.* Fol. Edinburgh, 1888.—*The Architectural Antiquities of Northern Gujarāt.* Roy. 4to. London, 1903.

J. Burgess, E. W. Smith, and A. Führer.—*Sharqi Architecture of Jaunpur.* 4to. 1889.

Capt. T. S. Burt.—'Description, with drawings, of the ancient Stone Pillar at Allahabad.' *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. iii, pp. 105-123.

A. C. Campbell.—*Glimpses of the Nizam's Dominions.* Fol. Bombay, 1898.

Sir J. Campbell.—'Mandū,' in *Jour. Bom. B. R. As. Soc.*, vol. xix, pp. 154-201.

A. M. Cantrell.—*Account of the Ruins at Bijāpur.* Bombay, 1872.

Major H. H. Cole.—*Illustrations of Ancient Buildings in Kashmir.* Roy. 4to. London, 1869.—*Architecture of Ancient Delhi.* 28 plates. 4to. London, 1872.—*Illustrations of Buildings near Multra and Agra.* Roy. 4to. London, 1873.—*Preservation of Ancient Monuments, India.* Ten parts, 104 plates. Fol. Calcutta, 1884-5.—Eighty-six plates from the preceding, and fourteen others. Fol. London, 1896.—*Three Reports on Preservation of Ancient Monuments in India.* 8vo. Simla, 1882-4.

H. Cousens.—*Bijāpur, the Old Capital of the 'Adil Shahi Kings.* 8vo. Poona, 1889.—*Lists of Antiquarian Remains in the Central Provinces, Berar, and Haidarabad.* 4to. Calcutta, 1897-1900.—'Chālukyan Temples.' *Jour. Ind. Art.*, vol. ii (1888), No. 17, and vol. iii (1890), No. 28.—'Conservation of Ancient Monuments in the Bombay Presidency.' *Jour. Bom. B. R. As. Soc.*, Centenary vol., pp. 149-162. *Sind Tiles*, coloured plates. Fol. London, 1906.

W. G. Cowie.—'Notes on Some of the Temples in Kashmir.' *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. xxxv, pt. i, pp. 91 ff.

J. Crawford.—*Journal of an Embassy to the Court of Ava.* 4to. London, 1829.

H. Creighton.—*The Ruins of Gour, Described and Represented in sixteen Views.* 4to. London, 1817.

Sir A. Cunningham.—*The Bhilsa Topes, or Buddhist Monuments of Central India, &c.* 8vo. London, 1854.—*The Stūpa of Bharhut, a Buddhist Monument illustrative of Buddhist Legend and History.* 4to. Simla, 1877.—*Mahābodhi; or, the Great Buddhist Temple at Buddhagayā.*



4to. London, 1892.—*Archaeological Survey of India Reports*. 1862-84. 23 vols. 8vo. Calcutta, 1871-1887.—'Essay on the Arian Order of Architecture, as exhibited in the Temples of Kashmir.' *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. xvii, pt. ii, Sept., 1848.

Capt. J. D. Cunningham.—'Notes of the Antiquities of the Districts within the Bhopal Agency.' *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. xvi, pt. ii, pp. 739-63.

T. and W. Daniell.—*Antiquities and Views in India*. 143 plate.. Folio. London, 1799.

H. C. Fanshawe.—*Delhi Past and Present*. 8vo. 1902.

J. Fergusson.—*Illustrations of the Rock-cut Temples of India*. Folio. London, 1845.—*Picturesque Illustrations of Ancient Architecture in Hindustan*. Folio. London, 1847.—*The Rock-cut Temples of India, &c.*, illustrated by photographs by Major R. Gill. 8vo. London, 1864.—*On the Study of Indian Architecture*. 8vo. London, 1867.—*Tree and Serpent-Worship*: Illustrations of Mythological Art in India. 2nd edition. Roy. 4to. London, 1873.—*History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*. 8vo. London, 1876.—*Archaeology in India*. 8vo. London, 1884.

J. Fergusson and J. Burgess.—*The Cave-Temples of India*. 8vo. London, 1880.

J. Fergusson and P. Meadows Taylor.—*Architecture at Beejapoor*. Folio. London, 1866.—*Architecture in Dharwar and Mysore*. Folio. London, 1866.

A. Kinloch Forbes.—*Râs Mâlâ: Hindu Annals of the Province of Gozerat*. 1st ed. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1856.

J. Forbes.—*Oriental Memoirs*. 4 vols. 4to. London, 1813.

L. de Forest.—*Indian Architecture and Ornament* (50 photographs). 4to. Boston, 1887.—*Indian Domestic Architecture*. n.d.

Lieut.-Col. Forrest.—*Picturesque Tour along the Rivers Ganges and Jumna*. Twenty-four views, &c. London, 1824.

G. W. Forrest.—*Cities of India*. 8vo. Westminster, 1903.

A. Foucher.—*Les Bas-reliefs du Stâpa de Sikri*. 8vo. Paris, 1903.—*L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhâra*. 1905.

A. Führer.—*Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions in the North-West Provinces and Oudh*. 4to. Allahabad, 1891.—*Monograph on Buddha Sakyamuni's Birthplace*. 1897.

Sir Lepel Griffin.—*Famous Monuments of Central India*. Obl. fol. London, 1886.

E. M. Grindlay.—*Scenery, Costumes, and Architecture, chiefly in Western India*. Thirty-six plates. Fol. London, 1826.

F. S. Growse.—*Mathurd, a District Manual*. 2nd ed. 4to. Allahabad, 1880.

B. R. Harrington.—*Portfolio Studies from Ancient Hindu Architecture*. Fol. London, 1888.

Capt. C. Harris.—*Ruins of Mandoo*. Fol. London, 1860.

Capt. C. Hart and J. Fergusson.—*Architectural Illustrations of the principal Buildings of Bijapur*. Fol. London, 1859.

T. H. Hendley.—'Decorative Art in Rajputana.' *Jour. Ind. Art*, vol. ii (1888), No. 21.

William Hodges.—*Select Views in India*. Forty-eight plates. Imp. fol. London, 1786.

Sir T. C. Hope.—*Surat, Bharoch, and other Cities of Guyardt*. 4to. Bombay, 1868.



- Sir T. C. Hope and J. Fergusson.—*Architecture of Ahmedabad*, photographed by Col. Biggs, R.A. 4to. London, 1866.
- Sir S. Swinton Jacob.—*Jaypore Portfolios of Architectural Details* (10 parts). Atl. fol. London, 1890, &c.
- J. L. Kipling.—'Indian Architecture of To-day.' *Jour. Ind. Art*, vol. i (1886), No. 3.—'Mosque of Wazir Khân at Lahor.' *Ibid.*, vol. ii (1888), No. 19.
- E. Impey.—*Views in Delhi, Agrâ, and Rajputana*. London, 1865.
- Sir S. Swinton Jacob.—*Jaypore Portfolios of Architectural Details*. Ten parts. Folio. 1898.
- Dubois de Jancigny and Xavier Raymond.—*Inde* (in 'L'Univers'); with eighty-four plates. 8vo. Paris, 1845.
- H. G. Keene.—*Handbook for Visitors to Delhi*. Calcutta, 1874.—*Handbook for Visitors to Agra*. Calcutta, 1874.
- Major Markham Kittoe.—*Illustrations of Indian Architecture from the Muhammadan Conquest*. Fol. Calcutta, 1838.—'Ruins and Pillar at Jajipur,' *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. vii, pp. 53-60 and 200-5.—'Notes on the Caves at Barâbar.' *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. xvi, pt. i, pp. 401-16.
- L. M. Langles.—*Monuments Anciens et Modernes de l'Hindustan*. 144 plates. 2 vols. Fol. Paris, 1821.
- Gust. Le Bon.—*Les Monuments de l'Inde*. 4to. Paris, 1893.
- List of Ancient Monuments of Bengal*. Fol. Calcutta, 1896.
- Sylvain Levi.—*Le Nepal*. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1905-6.
- Capt. Lyon.—*Notes to accompany photographs to illustrate The Ancient Architecture of Southern India*. Edited by J. Fergusson. 8vo. London, 1870.—*Notes to accompany photographs to illustrate The Architecture of Gujarat*. 8vo. London, 1870.
- Capt. T. S. F. Mackenzie.—*Description of the Halabid Temple*. 12mo. Bangalore, 1873.
- Genl. F. C. Maisey.—*Sanchi and its Remains*. 4to. 1892.
- Sir C. Malet.—'Description of the Caves or Excavations of Ellore.' *Asiat. Res.*, vol. ii, pp. 389-420.
- J. H. Marshall.—*Archaeological Survey of India: Annual Report for 1902-3*. 4to. Calcutta, 1904.—*Annual Report for 1903-4*. Calcutta, 1906.
- R. Montgomery Martin.—*History, Antiquities, and Statistics of Eastern India*. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1837.
- Sayyid Muhammad Latif.—*Lahore, its History, Architectural Remains, and Antiquities*. 8vo. Lahore, 1892.
- John Muir, LL.D.—*Account of a Journey from Agra to Bombay*. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1854.
- H. A. Oldfield.—*Sketches from Nipal. Historical and Descriptive*. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1880.
- Oriental Annual*. 7 vols. 8vo. London, 1834-40.
- Prof. F. Orlebar.—*The Monolithic Temples of India, with some Account of the Mural Paintings at Ajuntah*. 12mo. London.
- Major-General Sir A. P. Phayre.—*History of Burma*. London, 1883.
- Jas. Prinsep.—*Benares, Illustrated in a Series of Drawings*. Sm. folio. Calcutta, 1830-31.
- Rajendrala Mitra.—*Antiquities of Orissa*. 2 vols. Fol. Calcutta, 1875-80.—*Buddha Gaya, the Hermitage of Śākya Muni*. 4to. Calcutta, 1878.
- Ram Raz.—*Architecture of the Hindus*. 4to. London, 1834.



J. H. Ravenshaw.—*Gaur, its Ruins and Inscriptions*. 4to. London, 1878.

A. Rea.—*South Indian Buddhist Antiquities*. 4to. Madras, 1894.—*Chalukyan Architecture of Southern India*. 4to. Madras, 1896.—'Dravidian Architectural Details,' in *Jour. Ind. Art and Industry*, vol. v, No. 44, six plates. Fol. 1893.

Lewis Rice.—*Mysore*, a Gazetteer compiled for Government. Revised ed. 2 vols. 8vo. 1897.

E. Roberts.—*Views in India, China, and the Shores of the Red Sea, with Descriptions*. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1835.

L. Rousselet.—*L'Inde des Rajahs*. 317 gravures, &c. 4to. Paris, 1875.

R. Sewell.—*Lists of Antiquarian Remains in the Madras Presidency*. Madras, 1882.

Rev. M. A. Sherring.—*The Sacred City of the Hindus*. 8vo. London, 1868.

Wm. Simpson.—'Indian Architecture.' *Trans. R. Inst. Brit. Architects*, 1861-62, pp. 165-78.—'Classical Influence in the Architecture of the Indus Region and Afghanistan.' *Ibid.*, 1894, pp. 93-115 and 191-3.—'Buddhist Architecture in the Jellalabad Valley.' *Ibid.*, 1879-80, pp. 37-64.

E. W. Smith.—*Mughal Architecture of Fathpur Sikri*. 4 parts. Ar. Sur. 4to. Allahabad, 1894-98.—*Portfolio of Indian Architectural Drawings*. Fol. London, 1897.—*Mughal Colour Decoration of Agra*. Pt. i. 4to. 1901.—'Chaurâsi Gumbâz, Kalpi.' Eight plates. *Jour. Ind. Art and Industry*, vol. v (1893), No. 42.—'Wall-paintings from Fathpur Sikri.' Eleven plates. *Ibid.*, vol. vi (1895), pp. 65-8.

V. A. Smith.—*The Jain Stupa and other Antiquities of Mathura*. 1901.

R. Phenè Spiers.—*Architecture East and West*. 1905.

Carr Stephen.—*The Archaeology of Delhi*. 8vo. Ludhiana, 1876.

Major W. H. Sykes.—'An Account of the Caves of Ellora.' *Trans. Lit. Soc. Bombay*, vol. iii, p. 265, 1st ed.

Major M. Symes.—*Account of an Embassy to the Court of Ava in 1795*. 4to. London, 1800.

Lieut.-Col. Jas. Tod.—*Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han*. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1829-32.—*Travels in Western India*. 4to. 1839.

*Views of Beejapore and the Deccan*. 1845.

G. T. Vigné.—*Travels in Kashmir, Ladak, Iskard, &c.* 2 vols. London, 1842.

H. H. Wilson.—*Ariana Antiqua; A descriptive Account of the Antiquities and Coins of Afghanistan*. 4to. London, 1841.—*The Oriental Port folio*. Eleven litho. plates. Fol. London, 1841.

John Wilson, D.D.—*Lecture on the Religious Excavations of Western India*. Bombay, 1875.—'Memoirs on Cave-Temples and Monasteries, &c.' *Jour. Bom. B. R. As. Soc.*, vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 36 ff., and vol. iv, p. 340 ff.

Dr. W. H. Workman and Mrs. F. B. Workman.—*Through Town and Jungle, among the Temples and People of the Indian Plains*. Illustrated 8vo. London, 1904.

Col. H. Yule.—*Mission to the Court of Ava in 1855*. 4to. London, 1858







## *Other Publications of Interest*

### **THE AKBAR NAMA OF ABU-L-FAZAL**

Translated from the Persian by

**H. Beveridge**

Vol. I Reprinted 1972 xxxii : 694 pp Rs 65

Vol. II Reprinted 1972 : 600 pp Rs 65

Vol. III Reprinted 1973 xxxiii : 1342 pp Rs 145

### **THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS**

Ancient Indian Metaphysics

**Archibald Edward Gough**

Reprinted 1975 xxiii : 268 pp Rs 55

### **SHORT HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE**

**Ernst Horowitz**

Reprinted 1973 xxxi ; 188 pp Rs 20

### **THE MUGHAL EMPIRE**

**S. M. Jaffar**

Reprinted 1974 xvi ; 441 pp Rs 80

### **INDIA**

Its Life and Thought

**John P. Jones**

Reprinted 1974 448 pp Rs 65

### **THE HISTORY OF THE GREAT MOGHULS**

**Pringle Kennedy**

Reprinted 1974 544 pp Rs 100

### **MEMOIRS OF BABER**

**EMPEROR OF INDIA**

First of the Great Moghuls

**Lieut-Colonel F.G. Talbot**

Reprinted 1974 xv ; 254 pp Rs 60

### **A HISTORY OF ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY**

**Tozer, H. F.**

2nd Edition 1975 416 + xviii + 13 Maps Rs 75

### **HINDUISM**

**Sir Monier Monier-Williams**

Reprinted 1971 238 pp Rs 20

### **CASTE IN INDIA**

**Senart, E.**

Reprinted 1975 yiii + 224 Rs 50

## **ESS ESS PUBLICATIONS**

KD/6A, Ashok Vihar

Delhi 110052